FAITH DEVELOPMENT AND PSYCHOSOCIAL ACCOMPLISHMENT:

TRENDS IN ADULT INTIMACY GROWTH AND HIGHER FAITH STAGES

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the

School of Theology at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Barbara R. Grossman

May 1991

This dissertation, written by

<u>Barbara R. Grossman</u>

under the direction of <u>her</u> *Faculty Committee, and approved by its members, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Faculty Committee

Mary Elizabeth Mullino Moore
<u>Chairman</u>

William M. Clements

Edward Jurji

Dan H. Rhodes

Date *May 7, 1991*

Allen J. Moore

ABSTRACT

Faith Development and Psychosocial Accomplishment:

Trends in Adult Intimacy Growth and Higher Faith Stages

by

Barbara R. Grossman

This study examines one aspect of psychosocial development and faith development. High and low scorers from Measures of Personality Development, an Erikson-based measure representing successful and unsuccessful psychosocial resolution of intimacy versus isolation, were interviewed using James Fowler's Faith Development protocol. Scores on the Faith Development measure were analyzed to test whether or not subjects who scored high on the measure of intimacy actually were different in their structural faith development than subjects who were low scorers.

The results were inconclusive. The present sample of mostly childrearing women affiliated in a Reform synagogue scored predominantly at Stage 3 in Faith Development. The exceptions were two women in the high intimacy psychosocial group who scored at Stage 4 and Stage 5. These two exceptions are suggestive of a pattern, but the pattern is not statistically significant.

The relationship of the two developmental measures and the way the two measures define intimacy and development are discussed. One conclusion focuses on the apparent inability of the present psychosocial measure to distinguish qualities of intimacy resolution beyond conventional development of early formal operations.

The discussion also explores the possibility that the structural Faith Development tool does not register all structurally meaningful psychosocial accomplishment. This may point to valuable, unmeasured relationship development that accounts for how developing post-childrearing women advance quickly to Stage 5, pausing only briefly at Stage 4, after a long period of Stage 3 functioning. This invites reflection on a more subtle lateral development than Fowler has defined.

Applications for structural development in the congregation include suggested formats for education, pastoral care and small group sharing. The role of the rabbi is explored in terms of the opportunities to advance the qualitative development of persons' maturity of faith. In post-Piagetian terms, this refers to the accomplishment of post-formal operational thinking along with enhanced relationship skills. These qualitative processes of reflection in

relationship suggest that structural faith development represents a qualitative as well as a comprehensive movement of development.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank many individuals for the support and assistance that has allowed me to complete this project. Thanks to Dr. Julianne Flora-Tostado for my initiation into academic "procedural knowing" as well as a dear friendship. A warm thank you to Karen DeNicola for generously sharing her understanding of James Fowler's work and her enthusiasm for this study about women. My thanks also to Rabbi Allen Krause and President Cindy O'Neill for their permission to conduct this study in their congregation, and to the participants of this study for their trust and gift of themselves in the questionnaires and interviews.

On my dissertation committee, a special thanks to Dr. Mary Elizabeth Moore for her intensive editing of this manuscript and for her vision for what this research provides that is more valuable than significant statistical results. I want to thank Rabbi Ed Zerin, Ph.D. for his commitment to the quality and completeness of my thinking.

I acknowledge the cooperation of the Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. who have kindly given me permission to reproduce their testing materials. Thanks also to Dr. Gwenn Hawley who has made herself available to me by telephone.

A warm thanks goes to the Center for Research in Faith and Moral Development for permission to use their scoring materials and reproduce them in this manuscript, and specifically Dr. James Fowler and Dr. John Snarey for their consultation and support of the research process.

Finally, I want to thank my family, especially my husband Michael and my parents Sonia and Murray Robinson, for growing with me. I look forward to the development of my quest as it extends to my maturing daughters, Karun and Lissa, and my community.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iii

TABLES

v

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

As I have spent five years completing this project and twenty years from the beginning of my graduate education, a few words are offered to describe the process. I started graduate school in religion directly after college and after a period of profound disillusionment with myself, my values and my culture. The years of study at Columbia University and Union Theological Seminary were my effort and journey to find a meaningful reality more subtle than conventional definition.

I was no longer neatly classifiable in a formal religion, but I sought a deeper faith in a contextual and existential analysis of biblical literature. With the help of mentors such as James Sanders and Walter Wink, I located myself in a universe of private, spiritual meaning and consoled myself about my isolation.

The satisfaction of that period culminated in my understanding the communal process of reflecting ethically and existentially on the stories that have been transmitted across generations and ultimately canonized. These biblical stories, indeed all Bible genres, taken together, provide identity and at the

same time, empower a consciousness beyond identity through a counterpoint of ethical and theological critique. I saw in this dialectic of identity/continuity and ethical critique/change a creative process of growth and adaptation within community and personal life that I linked to revelation because it is a process that allows for continuous breakthroughs in living.

I have continued to honor this dynamic in language systems, for example, in psychotherapy where it describes the polarities of belonging and separating, the value of empathic listening and therapeutic confrontation, and the timing of congruent modalities and paradoxical interventions. These appear to me as alternate forms of Torah and Prophets, comforting woe and confronting weal.

Having fulfilled my curiosity about my culture, my next inquiry focused on psychotherapy and pastoral counseling. I suspect that while I had intellectually made a breakthrough, my emotional character lagged behind. The years of training and private practice have dramatically impacted my emotional style and I have benefited in all areas of my life, personally and interpersonally.

I have longed to contribute to my Judaism believing that it lacked the resources I needed as a youngster and young adult to assure my growth through all these passages. As I have observed many alienated individuals in my community at those stages, I believed that I had identified an objective need.

I had discovered that biblical religion incorporated a growth process that was useful to balance my deepest self and the claims of others in the ongoing conflicts of life. I sought for a vehicle that was formally Jewish in order to share these realizations. My first step was the discovery of Martin Buber who surely has been a spokesman for a deeply respectful mutuality. The connection was exciting, especially because he offered an explicit spirituality associated with specific qualities of relationship.

Also important to me was the communication network between Martin Buber and the European and American therapeutic community. It seemed too good to be true, and as I explored this therapeutic-Jewish realm through Martin Buber, it was indeed too good to be true. Martin Buber, the individualist, who found a way to be Jewish without being connected concretely to community was not sufficient for my vision in the next stage of

my life, however, nor did it meet the expectations for the bonding I perceive my religious community requires of its brilliant spokespersons.

Over and over I heard resistance to Martin Buber and names like Franz Rosenzweig, a dialogical thinker of the same period, were repeatedly suggested as a replacement. Yet men like Franz Rosenzweig did not have Martin Buber's connection to the current therapeutic community. The work of Barbara Krasner, a Buber heir, has been particularly breathtaking. For her, belonging and autonomy are balanced, not in stalemate, but in favor of the individuated growth of each generation where simultaneously all generations are enabled to stay in contact with tradition.

I took on the therapeutic task that Krasner and therapists of this genre recommend in addressing invisible loyalties and settling imbalanced legacies in my own original family. This was powerful in accomplishing personal and psychological goals. What was unforeseen, and yet so predictable, was how this crucial family conversation enabled me to return to my religious community in an innocence and yet a knowingness about all the layers of tradition that I had traversed in my journey to get to this comfort.

I had done my Masters' thesis on Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutic circle and I recognized the condition of second naivete. As I watched my fellow spiritual travelers, I was eager to tell them the process of coming home.

The process is not, nor has it ever been, a secret. Currently many rabbis and secularized Jewish social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists are exploring and utilizing family therapy for this healing purpose. I fancied myself in the role of describing how this therapeutic process parallels the ethical values and commitments in Judaism. I dreamed of demythologizing the tradition's almost sacred valuing of family in order to reveal a new appreciation for family that penetrates the conventional facade and stereotyped profile of Judaism as an ethnic group.

Alas. There are greater prophetic voices than mine. Rabbi Edwin Friedman's brilliant book (1985) highlights the parallel process of congregations and families. Krasner's work (1978, 1980, 1986) exegetes the renewed meaning of honor thy father and mother. I have nothing new to reveal. I am left to the simple satisfaction of perceiving sophisticated post-modern meaning in the traditional texts of my Sabbath prayers and the ancient rituals of my daughters' Bat Mitzvahs.

(Of course, in antiquity, my daughters would not have Bat Mitzvahs. Fortunately paradox is a relevant feature of stage development.)

Somewhere in this movement home, very likely in the sequence of conversation with my parents, I realized that I was traversing faith stages. Whether James Fowler's theoretical and empirical model is validated completely or in part, I found something compelling about his work in faith development.

What I have shared in this introduction serves to provide a texture to part of my Life Tapestry, much like the ones that I received from others through the interviewing process of this research. This one represents my personal quest for meaning through the stages of my life so far. It has been a totally engaging process involving feeling and thinking. I can identify and describe distinct chapters of knowing the world and experiencing myself, each representing radical reorientations and reshapings of life. This is my personal access to Fowler's structural theory.

My hypothesis comes out of my life. Yet it is also linked with the current concerns of this culture. I perceive my story to be similar to the kind of struggle for development that occurs regardless of what faith tradition one is born into or what personal family history one endures. Visionary spokespersons

from the culture of individualism who experience pain speak eloquently of the landscapes of Stage 4 isolation. They speak from a multitude of religious traditions (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler & Tipton, 1985; Wink, 1973). This research project comes out of my own story which is located in one particular community: liberal Judaism.

A key remedy that I have perceived comes in a breakthrough in relationships, or, in psychological terms, intimacy. The forthcoming review of recent publishing activity within the Jewish community will confirm the high visibility of this new interest. The quest of this research is to discover if the development of intimacy is related to faith development, and if it is, is it sufficient to guarantee midlife women, Stage 5 development.

Rabbi Neil Gillman writes a communal Life Tapestry in a recent article (1989) describing the growth of the Jewish community and rabbinical training and leadership. He describes the radical reorientations that occurred about one hundred years ago when (non-Orthodox) Judaism was transplanted into Emancipation-style thinking in which the methodology of learning and relationship to learning involved a secularization of the study of Torah. This shift into emphasizing factual accuracy, normative neutrality and

the separation of study from belief created a new authority in modern historiography, leaving the literal understanding of Torah as revelation a quaint chapter in history.

The motivation for this change was a desire for legitimizing and integrating Judaism into western culture and into American and European academia in order to enhance Jewish dignity and self-respect. The result has been an historical consciousness that has dominated Judaism to this day. With history as the source of knowledge and truth, change occurs by decision of the community of scholars. This locates authority internally with knowledgeable persons.

Some ambivalence has existed about this interiorizing of religious authority amongst Seminary leaders, Rabbi Gillman reports. Nevertheless, Jewish Theological Seminary has produced graduates modeled from a profile of academic excellence, where the best students have been encouraged to pursue professional roles in teaching and research, and practical course work like homiletics and pastoral counseling have been last priority, sparsely taught and expected to be learned on the job by those who chose to serve congregations. Congregational rabbis have typically been the less accomplished students.

What the Seminary graduated were experts in historical scholarship who were trained by professors who had never served a congregation and whose religious observance of Judaism was considered a private matter. This reinforced the separation of religion and knowledge. Furthermore, issues of belief and existential meaning were avoided. Rabbi Gillman (1989) accurately remarks that "academic excellence and professional skills alone do not make a rabbi" (p. 416).

Neil Gillman is describing here, I believe realistically, the demise of Stage 3 traditionalism. This testimony parallels my own observation as a child and young adult of the 1950s, 60s and early 70s, of a religious community lacking in spiritual direction and pastoral care. Growing up in that epoch, with the telescoped vision of those decades alone, did not provide the perspective of the impact of historicism.

This developmental interpretation offers a new meaning to the features of that time: personal religious practice and religious meaning were the prerogative of autonomous individuals and community came together to celebrate a common, special history. Interaction was dominated by cognitive values, certainly a passion for community survival, but on an intracommunal level no agenda was offered for personal

relational connection. My experience of that time was that more commitment was shown for providing matzah for Russian Jews at Passover than a concern for the personal and family well-being at the local level. This signifies nothing less than the collapse of traditionalism.

Rabbi Gillman's article (1989) is written from the point of view of the rabbi who has been trained to separate the historical from the religious; this takes apart the very structure of reality that made the history religious in the first place. This is what Rabbi Gillman calls "breaking the myth," and this is the direct result of believing in historical methods and applying them to revelation. This educational training made the rabbi an outsider and then the rabbi was expected to return to the congregation and provide religious education from inside the myth. Obviously, this was an impossible expectation.

Rabbi Gillman goes as far as saying that this intellectual detachment produced at least three generations of rabbis unprepared to apply Jewish learning to the suffering present in their congregations. This kind of alienation amounts to an unexpressed inner process that leaves everyone in the

community, including rabbis, unsupported. It also leaves congregants with a mixed message about the relevance of religion.

This developmental account of the Stage 3 transition into Stage 4 (transition from traditional-conventional faith to individuative-reflective faith) is not a loose and creative reading of Gillman's article. The article refers in the footnotes to Fowler's work and the multiple references to Paul Ricoeur's idea of pre-critical and literal, "breaking the myth," and "second or willed naivete" point to Rabbi Gillman's awareness of Stages 3, 4 and 5 respectively. The paradigm shift into Stage 5, Gillman reveals, involves the current generation of rabbinical students recognizing that historiography itself provides an interpretive lens which is just as much a construction of reality as the original myth. In short, there is no such thing as objectivity, and there is much pain to address in the congregation that is not satisfied by the curriculum of historiography. The posture of detachment, at least for this seminary elite, has melted.

The paradigm shift is evident in other quarters as well. In the last five years, the publishing activity representing personal, psychological and spiritual

themes alone has been extraordinary, with the same themes providing focus for retreats and forums. Within the congregation, rabbis are expanding their pastoral counseling role (Marc Angel, 1987; Ed Friedman, 1985; Jacob Goldberg, 1989; Norman Goldman, 1989; Herman Horowitz, 1984; Hershel Jaffe, 1986; Robert Katz, 1985; Pesach Krauss, 1988; Levi Meier, 1988, 1989; Neal Rose, 1989; Harold Schulweis, 1979), and leadership is developing to address guidance in personal prayer (Ted Falcon, 1986; Edward Hoffman, 1981; Aryeh Kaplan, 1985; Jonathan Omer-Man, 1986; Zalman Schacter, 1983). Committed lay people (Paul Cowan & Rachel Cowan, 1987; Susan Weidman Schneider, 1985, 1989) are becoming involved in relational concerns like intermarriage and outreach.

There is also considerable activity by Jewish mental health professionals who are developing ideas and projects that address problems like support systems for the aging (Kerry Olitzky, 1988), the symptomatology of children of Holocaust survivors (Kinsler, 1981; Kuperstein, 1981; Porter, 1981), dating and marriage patterns (Bubis, 1977; Reuven Bulka, 1986; Carol Diament, 1989), serving and saving the Jewish family (Bubis, 1977, 1987), as well as various theoretical and intellectual integrations of Jewish values with psychotherapy (Reuven Bulka, 1981, 1986; Robert Katz,

1975, 1985; Barbara Krasner, 1978; Norman Linzer, 1978; 1984; Levi Meier, 1988; Zalman Schachter, 1983; Moshe Halevi Spero, 1980, 1986; Edward Zerin, 1988a; 1988b).

Long before this current culture-wide shift commenced, Martin Buber was one of a small number of outstanding individuals in his generation who appears to have moved beyond this developmental impasse of individualism. Paul Mendes-Flohr (1985) records a transition in Buber's movement from mysticism and intellectualism to dialogue (p. xviii). How do some people like Buber and Rosenzweig accomplish this development? It is a hard question to answer in definite terms. Certainly development ultimately requires a tremendous individual effort while it is also influenced and interwoven with the environment. For Martin Buber certain factors in his personal life may have promoted deeper attention to philosophical and relational values.

Maurice Friedman, who has spent his vocational lifetime translating and presenting Martin Buber's work to generations of Americans, asserts that Buber's theology of presence and mastery of dialogue grew out of the mysterious loss of his mother at the age of four and their brief reunion when he was twenty, a visit Buber later called "mis-meeting" (Friedman, 1983, p. 5). This interaction with his mother stands in

dramatic contrast to Buber's relationship with his grandparents whose presence was constant and emotionally reliable in the deepest sense (Friedman, 1983, p. 106). Buber's life-long struggle with this core relationship defined the focus of a great deal of his intellectual and personal attention, and this appears to have produced personal and culturally meaningful development.

Further, Buber's long-term marriage to Paula Winkler provided a crucial "meeting" that nurtured and defined the process of relationship. Maurice Friedman credits Paula and this relationship with an invaluable role in Buber's healing from long-standing inner pain which then allowed him to write so clearly about the distinctions of I-Thou and I-It in terms of trust and confirmation of the other. This constitutes an authentic spirituality which is grounded in the ordinary personal development in relationship.

Buber's spirituality was not a loosely defined concern. His reflection took place intentionally with his intellect as well as with the passion of his personal life; it also occurred within the context of his Judaism. A recent and pioneering investigation of what was going on in Buber's life as he worked on the manuscript of I and Thou reveals that Buber was immersing himself in the study of religion in general

and Judaism in particular as he prepared for his lecture series on "Religion as Presence" at the Freies Judisches Lehrhause in Frankfort, which was then under the direction of Franz Rosenzweig (Horwitz, 1988, pp. 6-11).

The lectures, in fact, were an oral forerunner to the written I and Thou and represented a development beyond his work on Hasidism. Buber was also engaged in an intense and intimate letter exchange with Franz Rosenzweig. At the same time Buber was consulting three books on dialogical thinking: one by Rosenzweig, the others by Hermann Cohen and Ferdinand Ebner, all Jewish contemporaries. The relational characteristics of Buber's I and Thou emerged from a dynamic inquiry that was unfolding simultaneously in Buber's relationship with his mother, his wife, and his Judaism (Horwitz, 1988).

Buber's energy for understanding relationship included the study of psychology. His doctoral dissertation focused on theories of individuation. He also contributed to the psychoanalytic discussion of guilt and to conversations clarifying the therapist-client relationship (Katz, 1975).

Buber felt strongly that therapy is a contractual relationship and cannot be equated with the kind of dialogue that can occur between peers where something

much more than instrumental can occur which impacts the level of responsibility an individual takes for relationship and life. Buber emphasized this value of mutuality and virtually raised it to a stature of a sacrament. Students of Buber, like Barbara Krasner, have brilliantly seen in this a psychology of covenant relationship with I-Thou dialogue providing a possibility for healing family relationships. Having persevered to this level of dialogical spirituality, Martin Buber has become a resource for others on their developmental quest (Yedwab, 1986).

With Martin Buber, the door is opened for an exegesis of covenant that is rich with psychic and symbolic truth. One such interpretation illuminates the spiritual health and maturity that is offered by the ideal organization of the Jewish family according to the legal system of Torah. Kaplan, Schwartz and Markus-Kaplan (1984) are among those who see the individuation process itself dialectically outlined in the fundamental rules of Jewish family life.

Barbara Krasner's work with rabbis amounts to another reinterpretation of covenant in terms of modern relationships. Here, rabbis are invited to be spokespersons and guardians of trustworthiness between people in families and in community. This kind of ethical living, Krasner believes, can inspire the quest

to know God as the source of trust (Krasner, 1980). These kinds of interpretations indicate a revaluing process that is going on with tradition that does not reduce it to "shoulds" and "have-tos." This is an example of second naivete where the meaning of relationship is being powerfully reclaimed from tradition.

Fowler's faith development stage theory identifies six distinct stage patterns. Each of these stages is described in terms of seven dimensions of maturation: (1) form of logic, (2) form of word coherence, (3) perspective-taking, (4) locus of authority, (5) bounds of social awareness, (6) form of moral reasoning, and (7) form of symbolic logic. Each of these aspects must develop or shift in order to mark stage growth.

Reports have been cited of the dynamic, cognitive and relational activity in Martin Buber's life as a model of the active and comprehensive commitment and the effort required to resolve conflict and achieve meaning and satisfying value over the course of a lifetime. Certainly faith development cannot be reduced to accomplishments with just one dimension such as intimacy. Nevertheless, one particular index can be

a crucial bridge to the next stage of development, owing simply to what has already been developed and what is missing in this particular culture.

This is Constance Leean's message. Leean is the chief researcher in the Module II, Gallup faith development study. She sees the challenge of growing through the intimacy versus isolation psychosocial stage as the step that can potentially penetrate the American stagnation in faith development Stage 4. Her study reveals that the successful resolution of intimacy development is dramatically lacking in her middle-aged sample. She links the characteristic of isolation with Stage 4 which is embedded in our culture in the mores and mindset of individualism (Leean, 1988).

Leean uses Robert Bellah's independent study (1985) and his analysis of the problem of individualism as a confirmation of her own concern with American society and the Christian church (Leean, 1988). Robert Bellah describes how classical republicanism, Reformation Christianity and an almost ontological individualism in John Locke converge in the United States to form a utilitarian and expressive individualism, more or less coexisting with classical republican philosophy and biblical religion. The consensus centers around the dignity and autonomy of

the individual. As this modern individualism has become even more dominant in the culture and as classical and biblical influences have receded, what remains, Bellah asserts, is an isolated self very much in danger (Bellah, pp. 142-44).

In another section of his book, Bellah refers to the impasse of modernity as "the culture of separation" (p. 277). What guarantees entrance into this American ethos is the advance into the middle class (p. 151). Bellah ultimately calls for a transformation of our culture: "What we find hard to see is that it is the extreme fragmentation of the modern world that really threatens our individuation, that what is best in our separation and individuation, our sense of dignity and autonomy as persons, requires a new integration if it is to be sustained" (p. 286).

Bellah's vision is a shift beyond negotiating among competing interests toward discovering a common ground of understanding and responsibility. Constance Leean interprets this shift as movement into a conjunctive faith stance (Stage 5) where the integration of polarities and movement toward unity and diversity are valued. Leean is adding a developmental understanding to Bellah's work that allows both studies to come together to assert the same message about the

value of relationship and an inclusive way of being in the world at this juncture of the development of the American character.

The shift from Stage 4 to Stage 5 fundamentally requires, "the ability or willingness to step outside of one's own boundaries in order to become vulnerable to truths and claims of persons and groups from other traditions or experiences" (Leean, p. 581). The challenge of moving to Stage 5 appears to be none other than that of resolving the matter of intimacy.

What is the pressure to develop to Stage 5? Surely, Fowler does not say that one stage is better than another. To the contrary, he explains at great length how each stage has an integrity in the progress of life and is acceptable in its own terms (Fowler in Dykstra & Parks, 1986). At the same time, later stages clearly resolve the issues of earlier stages.

There are indeed many family, community and world problems at the level of crisis that are needing to be solved. The middle-aged generation in America, who face caring for and nurturing younger as well as older generations, and who contribute to the ongoing future of humanity, are facing these crises without the strengths and resources necessary (Leean, 1988). This

is true in general, and voices inside the Jewish community echo the urgency of this need for transformation (Fein, 1989).

A value may also exist in identifying a model of spiritual maturity in structural-developmental terms particularly a model that interacts with traditional language and produces an exploration and understanding of new ways to accomplish educational, counseling and community goals.

While Fowler describes his stages in terms of evolution and development, Bruce Willats is not shy to assert where the line of spiritual maturity can be drawn when he writes in his dissertation:

> Stage 4, the individuating-reflexive stage might be characterized as the stage immediately preceding mature faith. (Willats, 1981, p. 176)

He supports his definition by quoting one of Fowler's descriptions of Stage 4:

> The self starts to emerge from its previous encircling dependence upon significant others for construction and maintenance of an identity and faith....People at this stage hold themselves accountable for authenticity, congruence, and consistency in the relation between self and outlook....The individual at Stage 4 typically aspires to a comprehensive ideology. (Fowler & Keen, 1978, pp. 69-73)

That spiritual maturity has not sufficiently occurred in Stage 4 is evident according to Willats by the way the believer distorts the construction of others' points of view in a defensive posture to

justify his or her own truth. Secondly, symbols are translated into usable concepts and are discarded if practical meaning is not found. This amounts to demythologizing and minimizing the power of symbol which is a reductionistic fallacy. Finally, Stage 4 individuals display an excessive reliance on conscious processes and ego control which suggests a fear of the non-rational (Willats, p. 176).

In contrast, Stage 5, the conjunctive faith stage is what Willats equates with mature faith. He quotes Fowler from the same source:

> Stage 5 requires that one know suffering and loss, responsibility and failure, and the grief that is an inevitable part of having made irrevocable commitments of life and energy. Age thirty is a minimal age. Stage 5 most often is a midlife development if it comes at all. (Fowler & Keen, p. 81)

Here the ego can tolerate ambiguity, mystery, and apparent irrationalities without premature closure. Further, the ego is able to surrender its dominant role and relate dialectically with the self. This invites the emergence of symbolic meanings from deeper recesses of the psyche. Fowler distinguishes Stage 5 with respect to myth: Stage 5 "establishes or reclaims a relationship to myth, symbol, and ritual in which the affective and esthetic import are rejoined with the ideational content and are allowed to make an impact on their own terms" (Fowler & Keen, p. 82).

Stage 5, then, according to Willats, is the threshold of spiritual maturity. This study is concerned with the advance of faith development and whether psychosocial intimacy accomplishment is as important a theme as some of the literature suggests.

The following chapter will present the theory of faith development including its origins and formulation, and the interview tool which Fowler designed to score faith stages. The context of this discussion is an effort to place Fowler as a participant in the structural family of developmental theories and at the same time display Fowler's attempt at an integration that includes or parallels functional development. The response and critique by psychologists as well as Christian and Jewish religious educators will provide a reflection of the problems and scope of Fowler's project. This sets a background for the construction of the hypothesis.

Chapter 3 describes the design of the empirical study which involves the comparison of two experimental groups who score high and low in psychosocial functioning and their structural faith development scores. This provides a contrast of the two theories by inquiring into whether individuals who are different according to one theory are also different according to the other. Chapter 4 presents the results. The final

chapter returns to the central focus of Fowler's structural faith development theory and the more functional psychosocial theory and their relationship.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

The purpose of this research is to explore and test a set of theoretical relationships between lifecycle development as defined by Erik Erikson and faith development as formulated by James Fowler. The background for this research is the relatively new field of adult development in psychology. This includes a diverse range of theorists and researchers who have investigated the maturing process in adults from the perspectives of cognition, moral reasoning, relationships, and lifecycle accomplishment.

The Context of Faith Development Theory

James Fowler has entered the conversation about adult development and has incorporated all of these psychological designs into a synthesis under the rubric of faith development. The construction of stages of faith represents the fruits of Fowler's initial and ongoing research, along with a rather profound interaction with these other developmental paradigms.

At the same time, faith development is sourced from a theological vision enunciated by H. Richard Niebuhr in a lifetime of work that has stimulated a new generation of creative theologians. Among them is James Fowler, who completed his doctorate with a dissertation on the doctrine of faith in H. Richard

Niebuhr. Therefore, the context of faith development is both psychological and theological. Faith development incorporates two independent disciplines or conversations and relates them in a common venture (McDargh, 1983, p. 35).

The antecedents for this kind of collaboration of psychology and theology on the subject of faith has been traced by Richard Shulik. He pays particular attention to the psychologists of religion who believe that faith can be developed by deliberate effort. He favors the work of William James, rather than someone like Kierkegaard for whom faith is understood as a function of grace (Shulik, 1979, p. 7).

James' interest in the experience of religious faith led him to classify two primary styles of religious belief systems: (1) "healthy-minded" religious faith based upon, "mature, rational, open-minded premises" which is conducive to mental health; and (2) "sick-minded" religious faith based upon "fear, narrow-mindedness, concrete thinking" which contributes to prejudice and psychological disorders. James' pragmatism enabled him to claim that healthy-minded faith is achievable by purposeful pursuit and cultivation (Shulik, p. 6).

Gordon Allport entered the discussion on the side of an implicit developmental perspective, according to Shulik, by addressing the kind of growth that is possible in neutral, descriptive language. He used the term "extrinsic" religious faith as a form of faith based upon external sources of support and characterized by virtually mindless repetitive ritual practices that produce comfort, conformity, and suppression of intellectual and emotional inquiry. In contrast, Allport's "intrinsic" religious faith is based upon intellectual curiosity, personal experience, spontaneous feelings and logic (Shulik, 1979, p. 7).

Allport's extrinsic-intrinsic characterization provides a rudimentary form of development theory. He understood that children go through stages of religious belief that are extrinsic. He suggested that for certain adults whose religious faith remains extrinsic, it is largely a function of limited intellectual endowment (Shulik, p. 8).

More recent ancestors to this interdisciplinary discussion have been interested in secular forms of faith. Shulik cites theologians Harvey Cox and J. Dittes and sociologists Peter Berger and M. Yinger as the most outstanding spokespersons for recognizing that secular beliefs, practices and affiliations can fulfill religious needs, and therefore, the word "religion"

does not need to refer to institutional congregations that we are accustomed to associating with the use of the word "religion" (Shulik, p. 8).

In the 1970s, research developed around defining and measuring the phenomenon of "invisible religion." Shulik traces the work of R. Machalek and M. Martin which represents one joint attempt at an interviewing technique where subjects are questioned about "their ultimate concerns and coping strategies in encountering basic life problems" (Shulik, p. 8). The interview does not require that the respondent answer in terms of religion and theology, and in fact, responses have been reported in terms of civic concerns, art, politics, literature, human relationships, and so forth. The concept of invisible religion illuminates the diverse forms that faith systems can take (Shulik, 1979, p. 9).

Less well-known is Shulik's reference to the sociologist P. Sorokin who undertook the classification of faith systems according to structural characteristics. This comes very close to the kind of structural and content analysis that is crucial to James Fowler's work. The difference is that Sorokin's analysis of "knowing systems" was directed not to

individuals but to whole cultures. The matter of structure focuses on how a system knows what it knows (Shulik, p. 11).

In describing and classifying several hundred cultures and civilizations throughout human history, Sorokin entertained briefly the possibility that these styles constitute a developmental sequence. The cyclic patterns of these knowing styles did not demonstrate to Sorokin a developmental schema. However, Richard Shulik asked if it is possible for an inquiry into an entire culture to provide the developmental data that is possible to generate in individual interviewing. This is where James Fowler's initial research provides a bridge (Shulik, 1979, p. 13).

Fowler's mentor, H. Richard Niebuhr himself stands in this interdisciplinary conversation where issues of faith mix with social and psychosocial development. Influenced by George Herbert Mead and Harry Stack Sullivan and other psychologists of the "social self," not only does Niebuhr approach the problem of faith from the point of view of human selfhood, he also elaborates the process of developing faith as an accomplishment of loyal and trustworthy relationships in a social matrix (McDargh, p. 25). This language is reminiscent of the previous chapter about Martin Buber.

H. Richard Niebuhr has been credited with Buber's influence on American Protestant thought (Marty & Pierman, 1965).

The lifelong task of negotiating trust amidst disappointment and disillusionment, for Niebuhr, is a task of continuous creation and integration of self amidst inner and outer conflicts of loyalty. The psychological aspect of this process is the internal project, and the external aspect is a political and ethical one involving the search for a principle that can order priorities, loyalties and resources and guide action (McDargh, 1983, p. 25).

Niebuhr's view of the life task lends itself easily to a structural-developmental paradigm in psychology because it is a description of a life process of becoming, "disembedded from one set of loyalties, social expectations or ways of perceiving obligations in order to respond to larger, more inclusive demands for action" (McDargh, p. 28). Development is none other than the project of making more and more adequate cognitive maps and moral meaning amidst the conflict from the inner and outer manyness of competing loyalties.

In Niebuhr's last years, his final lectures and writings invite a social science approach in researching the relationship between explicitly

religious faith and the phenomenon of faith understood in the context of ordinary life. The phenomenon of faith includes the reflected and unreflected symbolic and conceptual assumptions that individuals have about life in general, especially their interpersonal relations; it also includes "noetic faith," which is a person's reflected and unreflected belief about the world environment. Niebuhr urged inquiry into these phenomena, and he anticipated the results of such research with hints about the congruence of the two modes of faith, the two ways of learning trust (McDargh, 1983, p. 35).

James Fowler's work responds to this call. Fowler's early post-graduate experience in a retreat center for clergy, listening to hundreds of personal stories of faith, positioned him to take up the task of operationalizing Niebuhr's definition of faith. Erik Erikson's work on the eight stages in the human lifecycle was the first model Fowler utilized to sort out what he was hearing (Fowler & Keen, 1978, p. 17).

Soon after, Fowler encountered Lawrence Kohlberg at Harvard University Graduate School of Education, who used a structural-developmental schema from Jean Piaget to investigate the patterns of moral reasoning over the course of the human lifecycle. This provided the next step (Fowler & Keen, 1978). The formalist concern for

the structure of reasoning, rather than the concern for content of thought, parallels the manner in which Niebuhr looked at the "how of faith as a universal phenomenon rather than the what of faith's doctrinal contents" (McDargh, 1983, p. 36).

Faith Development Theory

Fowler's faith development research tool was born out of the structural-development theory and the Piagetian semi-clinical interview. This has provided a substantial amount of interview data and this in turn has allowed for progressive elaborations of Fowler's work both theoretically and empirically, and has attracted national and international attention amongst religious educators and psychological researchers (McDargh, 1983, p. 36).

Currently, Fowler's research is conducted by James Fowler himself and a research colleague and associate director, John Snarey, at the Center for Research in Faith and Moral Development at Emory University. Snarey is a graduate from Harvard University in 1982, a former student of Lawrence Kohlberg, and an author, researcher and recipient of numerous awards for research. A center coordinator, Karen DeNicola, also engages in this research, coordinates research consultation and communication amongst a nationwide network of researchers.

This expansion of personnel is paralleled by the development of the conceptualization of the project itself. Each successive publication by Fowler is a further clarification and expansion of what the universal activity of human faith is about. Not only does Fowler continue to wrestle with the dynamics of faithing, but he also presses on the psychological constructions in order to get at deeper, more comprehensive dimensions of the self (McDargh, 1983, p. 37).

One of the indirect benefits of Fowler's recurrent evaluations of his terminology and his method is that he has enlarged on the scope of the initial developmental framework provided by Piaget. Fowler has persevered to incorporate an affective dimension of knowing which is missing from Piaget and Kohlberg, though acknowledged by William James in his use of the word, "passional." The added dimension will have far reaching significance both for conceptualizing faith and theorizing about adult development (Fowler & Lovin, 1980, p. 60).

The ongoing engagement and expanded understanding of the nature of this universal activity of faith also results in variations in how Fowler describes faith development over the fifteen years of his writings. Different essays by Fowler emphasize faithing from

different aspects, "faithing" being one of his enduring metaphors for the dynamic quality of faith. Fowler consistently points to the comprehensiveness of faith by defining faith as "a mode of knowing and being" that is experienced as a "felt sense" which underlies and unifies a person's experience of the world. Fowler has also uniformly written about faith as the "making, maintenance and transformation of human meaning," and he links this process to a person's attachments and commitments which endow the relational patterns of everyday life with significance (Fowler, 1980, p. 64-65).

The semi-clinical interview is a conversation that listens for how a person spontaneously makes meaning out of death, loss, suffering, moments of joy, intimacy, vulnerability, beliefs, rituals and values. These are the opportunities that most dramatically invite meaning-making. The interview is then analyzed to distinguish formal patterns or structures of thought, value and constitutive knowing (McDargh, 1983, p. 39).

Fowler has identified six stages of faith development that initially parallel Kohlberg's six stages of moral development. Each of these stages are comprised of seven aspects which are scored along a developmental continuum and represent modifications of

Piaget and Kohlberg. These aspects are named as follows: form of world coherence, locus of authority, bounds of social awareness, perspective-taking (alternately known as role-taking), form of logic, symbolic functioning and form of moral judgment (Fowler, Moseley & Jarvis, 1986b).

Form of logic, perspective-taking and form of moral judgment are built upon Jean Piaget, Robert Selman and Lawrence Kohlberg respectively. The remaining four aspects are new to development theory, and are brought by Fowler from other sources, most noticeably Paul Ricoeur and the heritage of H. Richard Niebuhr which is George Herbert Mead, Martin Buber and Josiah Royce (Fowler, 1980, p. 54).

Whereas formal operational thinking represents for Piaget the highest form of cognitive development, for Fowler, it is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for Stage 6. For Kohlberg, principled moral reasoning is the highest stage of development; for Fowler, a sense of personal commitment and action to universal moral principles is also required. For the developmental aspect called, "perspective-taking," Fowler follows Robert Selman's formulations of natural perspective-taking through to Stage 3 at which point the individual is capable of a mutual, interpersonal perspective. Beyond Stage 3, Fowler relies on more

inclusive and developed capacities for empathy and solidarity with wider circles of humanity and ultimately the commonwealth of Being. This summarizes the way Fowler consistently reflects upon and extends the derivative development scales (McDargh, 1983, p. 42).

In the aspect of faith development designated "locus of authority," the developmental process is characterized by progressively increasing personal responsibility. The individual increasingly evaluates critically the authority of significant others, valued groups, and ideologies and principles on the basis of internal experience and self-validation. The endpoint of this development is a negotiated authority that respects self and others. The locus of authority aspect of development naturally entails an evaluation and judgment that prioritizes trust and loyalties. This aspect touches the logic of conviction that will be described shortly (Fowler, 1978, p. 89; McDargh, 1983, pp. 9, 32).

Another aspect of development, "bounds of social awareness," focuses on the extent and accuracy of inclusiveness with the relational groups in which persons define their identity and moral responsibility. The distinction between social awareness and perspective-taking has to do with the focus of social

awareness on the persons who are significant for composing and maintaining identity and a meaningful world (Fowler & Vergote, 1980, pp. 76-77).

Through two other aspects of development, "form of world coherence" and "symbolic functioning," Fowler's stages track the increasing capacity of an individual to tolerate complexity, paradox and conflict. These insights are the result of Fowler's reflection on what is missing from Piaget's cognitive development theory concerning the construction of non-empirical, imaginative convictions that employ images and symbols and synesthetic fusions of feeling and sensory information. These aspects are intended to include left and right hemispheric forms of thought which is comprised of regressive, pre-conceptual, pre-linguistic as well as primitive imagery (McDargh, 1983, p. 42).

The inclusion of the non-rational allows for a more complete observation of the dynamic around which transformations of meaning and consciousness occur in the total self-constitutive activity of meaning-making. This is not meant to negate the role of logic or rational reflection, but to include the products of other modes of imaginal and generative knowing in a more comprehensive logic of convictional knowing (Fowler, 1980).

Fowler applies Paul Ricoeur's work on myth and symbol to decipher how individuals interpret the symbols of their faith. This is where we find the distinctions among "primary naivete," the stage of disillusionment, and then, a post-critical reappropriation of the symbols of the transcendent, what Paul Ricouer calls "second naivete." These are typical genres that are employed by persons at different stages of composing and integrating convictional meaning (Fowler, 1981, pp. 186-187).

The aspect of symbolic functioning is an opening for incorporating some kind of psychoanalytic vocabulary into the structural-developmental framework. Fowler includes an acknowledgment of unconscious factors in Stage 5 where he speaks of a heightened receptivity to ambiguous and hidden aspects of self and others. Prior to this, the individual is credited with only minimal attention to unconscious factors. This area of the unconscious is one of the newer discoveries in Fowler's project (McDargh, 1983, p. 43).

Following Piaget and Kohlberg, Fowler conceives of a stage as an integrated system of operations which makes for a stable, organismic dynamic with the environment that includes the composition and maintenance of a comprehensive frame of meaning. This dynamic interaction can be described by the

aforementioned differentiated aspects that at each stage form a dynamic unity. Successive stages are thought of as manifesting more complex inner differentiations and more elaborate, comprehensive and flexible operations. The seven operational aspects become integrated and reintegrated at each of the six levels or stages and produce more mature competencies. This growth in maturity is alleged to occur universally though not automatically (Dykstra, 1986, p. 200).

The development of these competencies result from the intersection of a person and the world in encounters of crises, novelties and challenge which threaten the structure of the current stage. If the person does not react defensively and screen out the dissonant data, the new stage emerges from the previous stage and transforms and integrates the structures of the earlier stage. These stages are, therefore, sequential, invariant, hierarchical and universal. The stages are:

Undifferentiated faith (infancy)

Stage 1: Intuitive-projective faith, ages 4 to 7

Stage 2: Mythic-literal faith, ages 6 to 11

Stage 3: Synthetic-conventional faith, ages 12 to adulthood

Stage 4: Individuative-reflective faith,

ages 18 to adulthood

Stage 5: Conjunctive faith, also known as

paradoxical-consolidative faith,

minimum, around age 30

Stage 6: Universalizing faith, minimum,

around age 40

(adapted from McDargh, 1983,

p. 39).

Later stages are described as "more adequate" and not better in the tradition of structural-development theory. This avoids the problem of dealing with psychology's language about pathology. Further, incorporating as many contributions as Fowler does in his definition of faith allows him to avoid being trapped by any language of psychology which would sabotage his interdisciplinary goal (McDargh, 1983, p. 41; Moseley, Jarvis, & Fowler, 1986, pp. 2-3).

This structural schema is clearly indebted to the structural theories and research that began with Jean Piaget; Fowler goes beyond Piaget and Kohlberg by his sheer comprehensiveness, as well as his assertion that this development is none other than the simultaneous constitution of the self and the known, which is the "core process" of faith (Fowler, 1980b, p. 64).

The character of these stage descriptions continue to be provisional, and this evidences the genuinely scientific effort of this research. Fowler and his colleagues evaluate and accommodate new data, and most recently this has occurred in the arena of gender differences through the work of Women's Ways of Knowing by Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule (1986) and the psychoanalytic research of Daniel Stern on the mother-infant relationship (1985).

That Fowler has moved dramatically beyond Piaget and Kohlberg's paradigm is underscored in the ego development work of Robert Kegan (1982). Fowler credits Kegan's work with helping him see the consequence of the cognitive-affect split in Piaget's and Kohlberg's structural focus on knowing. Kegan, as others, have noted that Piaget and Kohlberg do not deal adequately with actual behavior and choice in which cognition and feeling are united. Their theories do not address this unity because their focus is not on commitment and action. The activity of meaning-making on the other hand does involve both thought and feeling and therefore is a totally self-constitutive activity. This is one way Fowler's work represents a breakthrough (Fowler, 1980b, p. 58).

Further, both Piaget and Kohlberg approach the task of distinguishing the structure and characteristics of different stages without attending to the identity or self of the person at each stage. This means, for instance, that Kohlberg has described a succession of integrated structures of moral reasoning without developing a theory of the moral self or moral character. There is no connection between dynamics of the inner dialogue in moral choice and the actual or possible self produced out of the dialogue (Fowler, 1980b, pp. 60-61).

This is an understandable omission. Neither Piaget nor Kohlberg intended to provide a theory of ego or personality. When Robert Kegan in his dissertation proposed an extension of Piaget's structural paradigm to include all of the self's constitutive knowing, he understood this to involve bridging two historically distinct categories of knowing: developmentalism and constructivism (Fowler, 1980b, p. 60).

Piaget's theory of knowing, which strives for objective and technical descriptions of stability and change, fits our inherited tradition of developmentalism. Scientists such as Darwin and Skinner who are from different fields have participated in the understanding of the developmental sequences of living organisms. The inclusion of the self's identity

and the kind of knowing which emphasizes subjectivity
and passionate choice has a history in the philosophy
of existentialism as well as the tradition of
phenomenology. This is the human being as
meaning-maker perspective of constructivism. These are
the two logics and traditions of philosophy of
knowledge that are being related in this new kind of
developmental framework. Consequently, the new
paradigm is interested in both "the known" and the
knower in relation to what is known (Fowler, 1980b, p.
61).

Fowler's version of this new paradigm is to
amalgamate a logic of conviction with a logic of
rational certainty. In order to accomplish this logic
of conviction, he develops an interview scoring
calculus for perception, feeling, imagination and
rational judgment, as well as a structure for how each
of these functions is related to each other (Fowler,
1980b, p. 60).

Fowler asserts the difference between the
Piagetian paradigm, which is a logic of objects and of
relations between objects, and the holistic knowing of
faith, which composes self and object in relation to an
ultimate environment that funds everyday actions and
decisions. Even Piagetian formal operational logic
which involves the construction of nonempirical,

imaginative creations does not apprehend the contextual knowing of convictional logic. Convictional logic involves the self's investment of identity and value in these imaginative constructions (Fowler, 1980b, p. 64).

Fowler's example compares the personal urgency and relevance of theoretical physics with the relevance of faith and theology. Both kinds of language are composed of abstract ideas where direct verification is unlikely. Each confers approximate remoteness of empirical validation. Yet the mystery and intrigue about questions concerning the nature of black holes, the example Fowler uses, do not paralyze personal choices of lifestyle and commitments. There are situations and crises, however, where decisions do rely on our convictions about the ultimate nature of reality (Fowler, 1980b, p. 62).

Faith, then, is a mode of knowing and construing in which we compose ourselves and a holistic sense or image of an ultimate environment. Rational knowing plays a crucial role in conceptualizing, questioning and evaluating the products of this generative knowing. The dialectic of these two logics involve a transformation of knowledge into an integrated and contextualized knowing in which our choices, attachments, investments and values find coherence.

Faith development, then, is a function of the total constitutive activity of the ego (Fowler, 1980b, p. 62).

Fowler's work is a most ambitious and systematic effort to operationalize theoretically and study empirically human faith. As a summary of the foregoing discussion, the following quotation of one of Fowler's definitions of faith illustrates the internal dynamics of faith development as well as its multifaceted epistemological heritage.

Faith is:

The process of constitutive knowing

Underlying a person's composition and maintenance and a comprehensive frame (or frames) of meaning

Generated from the person's attachments or commitments to centers of supraordinate value which have power to unify his or her experiences of the world

Thereby endowing the relationships, contexts, and patterns of everyday life, past and future, with significance. (Fowler, 1980b, pp. 64-65).

Stage Descriptions

Building on the foundation of Fowler's developmental design, we move next to the profiles of each stage. These descriptions are empirically generated distinctions in styles of faith. An overview of the six stages of faith development begins with a prestage called undifferentiated faith which has been inaccessible to more elaborate definition, at least

prior to Daniel Stern's recent work, and definitely unavailable to the interview format (Fowler, in Blazer, 1989).

The pre-linguistic, pre-conceptual, "undifferentiated" stage of infant-caretaker interaction forms a disposition to the world in terms of trust, autonomy, hope and courage and their opposites. This provides an individual with a primal sense of the goodness or badness of self and world. The transition to Stage 1 begins with the use of language and ritual play (Fowler, 1980b, p. 68).

Stage 1 is named Intuitive-Projective faith because it is dominated by an imaginative perceptual process, full of wonder, and unrestrained by stable, logical operations. There is little awareness of cause and effect, nor sense of time and space. Therefore, the child experiences life moment to moment in fragments rather than as a whole. The perspective is egocentric. This means there is little ability to see another person's point of view (Fowler, 1980b, pp. 68-69).

The transition to Stage 2 begins with concrete operational thinking, a Piagetian term that Fowler utilizes to describe a cognitive advance where events and objects tie into a realistic narrative form with a meaning. At this stage, stories, beliefs and

observance create unity and belonging with a community. When common interests are involved, a child at this stage is able to take the perspective of others with increased accuracy and develop a sense of reciprocal fairness. Stories and symbols can have a significant impact at this stage, and typically they are dramatic and symbolic. The meaning of stories is interpreted in concrete and literal ways. Hence, the designation for Stage 2 is Mythic-Literal Faith (Fowler, 1981, pp. 135-37).

The Stage 2 individual is not able to stand back and reflect on stories or create conceptual meanings. There are adolescents and adults who continue to approach experience from this literal and concrete stage of development. Typically it is the conflict of contradictory stories, especially key authoritative ones like the Biblical story of creation and Darwin's theory of evolution where reflection becomes possible or necessary. The emergence of competing stories creates the need for a more personal relationship with meaning (Fowler, 1980b, p. 70).

Adolescence is typically the timing of Stage 3, Synthetic-Conventional Faith which is named for the shaping of values and commitments arising from the intense interest in peers. For many adults, this stage becomes a permanent equilibration. Authority resides

outside the self in others or in the group and relationships are far more interpersonal. It is therefore a conformist stage in the way it is attuned to the expectations and judgments of significant others. Personal relationship also is the dominant structure in the perception of ultimate reality and the metaphor for power and concepts about values (Fowler, 1980b, pp. 70-71).

This stage is therefore marked by its ability to generate abstract concepts and ideals and to synthesize ideas and experiences. This is the accomplishment of formal operations in Piagetian terms. Yet there is not sufficient identity and autonomous judgment to construct an independent perspective. So while beliefs and values are passionately held, they are more like ideologies through which the world is interpreted (Fowler, 1981, p. 151-43).

These ideas have not been systematically examined and there is not an objectivity about having reasoned them through and chosen them. Differences in perspective from other people are experienced as a reason to distance and feel alienated from those who are different. Authority is located in those who hold traditional authority roles, or in the consensus of a group (Fowler, 1981, p. 154).

One of the ways that Stage 3 breaks down and reveals the possibilities of Stage 4 is when there are contradictions between valued sources of authority, or radical changes of policy by official leaders. Interaction with a different culture can also produce this cognitive dissonance. These kinds of tensions can lead persons to reflect critically on how beliefs and values are formed and to discover how relative they are to personal background (Fowler, 1980b, p. 71).

This invites persons into a responsible reflection on all of their personal commitments, beliefs, attitudes and choices. When the movement toward Stage 4 is genuinely in process, the individual is faced with tense dichotomies:

> individuality versus group identity;
> unreflected subjectivity versus critical
> reflection and objectivity; self-fulfillment
> versus serving others; commitment to relative
> truth or envisioning and struggling with the
> possibility of an absolute. (Fowler, 1980b, p. 70)

Stage 4 involves a major shift in the person's sense of self as a composite of roles or social meanings to a self which is reflective and individuated. Self-identity and outlook are composed from a conscious awareness of one's own boundaries and inner connections. This differentiation is acknowledged in reactions, interpretations and judgments. Meanings are explicit and translated into

conceptual terms. This is a "demythologizing" stage that attends minimally to unconscious factors (Fowler, 1980b, pp. 71-72).

With this development of a person's self-definition, which includes a personalized meaning of life, career and competence are likely to be a focus during this stage. The challenge in Stage 4 is clearly to establish one's own sense of faith and to develop commitments which are grounded in personal experience and reflection. The timing of this stage is possible in late adolescence and early adulthood. Certainly this is the appropriate sequence for the kind of commitments that adulthood requires. However, it is important to remember that many adults do not accomplish this at all and a significant number of adults arrive at this stage in their mid-thirties or forties (Fowler, 1981, p. 181).

A restlessness with the clear, logical distinctions and abstract concepts, the sense that there is more to life than the flat, sterile meanings that self has created draw an individual to further development. A combination of disillusionment with rationality and a pressure from images of the deeper self, perhaps from childhood, can break through and

present the richer, paradoxical and dialectical nature of life and truth that is available at Stage 5 (Fowler, 1981, p. 183).

Stage 5 is often called a "second naivete" because it involves an integration into the self and world view of much that was suppressed or in the service of Stage 4's cognitive certainty. Here symbolic power is reunited with conceptual meanings. This invites a reclaiming and reworking of one's past, both personal and cultural, and a recognition of the embeddedness of one's social unconscious (Fowler, 1980b, p. 72).

Stage 5 individuals have grasped the depth of reality that symbols point to and they therefore appreciate symbols, myths and rituals from their own culture as well as those of other cultures. With the perspective that the cultural divisions of the human family are supported by a common, inclusive universal Being, the Stage 5 person has a transformed vision and an enhanced capacity for intimacy with other cultures and people. The commitment of this individual is to justice for all people while at the same time there is a profound loyalty to personal relationships (Fowler, 1980b, p. 73).

This stage is currently named Conjunctive Faith; in earlier work it is referred to as Paradoxical-Consolidative Faith. It is rare before

midlife owing to the amount of living and developing that is required to accomplish this level of affective and cognitive perception. The Stage 5 person knows the irrevocableness of commitments and actions, as well as loss. The foundation is set for generativity, whether by formal vocation or more casual mentoring in the service of supporting the identity and growth of others (Fowler, 1980b, p. 73).

It is exceedingly uncommon, but possible, that some individuals move into Stage 6 which is called Universalizing Faith. Fowler outlines that Stage 6 involves a twin process of decentering: one is an epistemological decentration from self, the other is a decentration of one's earlier values. Decentering from self involves a qualitative advance in perspective-taking where a person's own perspective includes a radically expanded world of cultures, classes and faiths that are very different from one's origins. The second dimension which is the decentering of values is related to what is happening to self. Such an individual no longer needs to choose values that at any level confirm some identity or sense of personal worth. This is the relationship of values and identity at previous levels. At Stage 6, the person is able to decenter to such an extent that his or her

participation in life is lived from a standpoint of identification with the Creator, the values of other beings, or Being itself (Fowler, 1984, pp. 68-69).

Such individuals are capable of fellowship with all persons regardless of faith stage or faith tradition. They are frequently revolutionary and at risk of martyrdom by people whom they hope to change; these people often see them as subversives. Dilemmas such as self-fulfillment versus serving others are no longer issues; nor is personal meaning or security as a Stage 6 individual lives both a full particularity and an inclusivity with all of God's children in the unity of the "One beyond the many" (Fowler, 1980b, p. 74).

Fowler's work is brilliant in its incorporation and refinement of an extraordinary range of developmental work. He has provided a multifaceted stage theory comprehensive enough to take on the entire structure of the ego's meaning-making activity. Some measure of Fowler's thoughtfulness and productivity may be due to his openness and the dialogical process that he has invited from the academic and faith communities.

Conferences over the years have generated sophisticated responses and critiques, and Fowler has interacted with these theological and psychological concerns thoughtfully. These sessions have included participants representing a wide range of academic and

denominational backgrounds. Most of this material has been published and Fowler's work has been enriched as a consequence (Stokes, 1983).

Fowler's Critics

Another result of this collegial participation is a clear record of the concerns from the academic community as well as responses from Christian and Jewish clergy and religious educators. Fowler is criticized for his conception of faith, for his theory of development, and for his conclusions about the relationship between faith and development. At the same time, he is widely admired and acknowledged for his integrating vision which has captivated the imagination and participation of a large number of academic and religious thinkers, leaders, and researchers in this pluralistic age (Dykstra, 1986, p. 2).

The most repeated criticism of Fowler is his conception of faith as a generic, universal, human process that can be analyzed structurally and independently of beliefs. Christian educators and theologians consistently struggle with his structural definition of faith where there does not appear to be a concept equivalent to what in biblical language is called God's redemption or grace. Jewish theologians

critique Fowler's work from a similar God-centered view of faith that requires human action. The Christian and Jewish response to Fowler's theory will be reviewed separately, as will the psychological response to the theory and operationalization of faith development in the interview protocol.

A chorus of critical writings, including Craig Dykstra, James Loder, J. Harry Fernhout, Gabriel Moran and Robert Wuthnow, all protest that Fowler has accomplished something more about ego development than about what Christians or any particular religious community can call faith. The discussion back and forth hinges on differing definitions of faith. J. Harry Fernhout asserts that the core of faith is commitment, and while what Fowler has described includes commitment, his definition is so amorphous and unwieldy that the commitment aspect gets lost (Fernhout in Dykstra, 1986, p. 86). James Loder views Fowler's work more as a study about the ego's competencies in structuring meaning than about faith. Loder argues for a biblical definition of the word, "faith" (Loder & Fowler, 1982, pp. 133-48).

Craig Dykstra, editor of a collection of critical articles about faith development, prefers a dialogical approach to a study of faith where traditions or individuals in a tradition share their perspective, and

a process of agreement and disagreement uncovers several definitions of faith. Faith, then, is not generic, nor is it an achievement of development; it is God-oriented, religious, and a gift. Atheists would therefore be excluded from the discussion (Dykstra, 1986, p. 55).

Dykstra, who actually appreciates the pre-reflective and pre-conscious dimension of faith, sees the value of Fowler's work as a way of conceptualizing a level of preparation for faith that is a foundation for an individual's life of faith. Dykstra would therefore not confine a faith concept to this structural and cognitive groundwork, but rather build on it (Dykstra, 1986, pp. 256-59).

The religious educator, Gabriel Moran, addresses the separation of faith and belief from a more conciliatory point of view. He perceives that Fowler's work inherits the split between the "how" and the "what," i.e. structure and content, from Piagetian-style theory. Moran believes this is a tempting distortion in modern, western theory-building. However, Moran adds very perceptively, that much of Fowler's efforts are directed at overcoming Piaget's limitations (Moran, 1983, p. 110).

Fowler has responded to this issue with <u>Becoming Adult, Becoming Christian</u>, which is an attempt to relate his conception of faith structure with the content of his own personal maturing in the realm of vocation. Unfortunately, the structural discussion and the chapters on Christian vocation are noticeably very loosely related, which suggests that the integration of structure and content is a more demanding agenda than has yet been accomplished (Yedwab, 1986, p. 37). According to Sharon Parks, this structure and content split originates in the thought of Kant and is borrowed implicitly by Piaget (Parks in Dykstra & Parks, 1986, p. 141).

Moran's theorizing about religious development follows Fowler's process orientation and avoids the problematic structure/content issue by following Erik Erikson's non-structural, developmental framework. Moran also sidesteps the faith/ego development confusion by asserting that people are essentially religious and that religious development is whatever allows openness to learning and growth. The word "religious" therefore becomes equivalent to development, and the emphasis of his process-description places greater focus on the affective and inspirational aspects (Moran, 1983).

The theme that Fowler is not sufficiently concerned with affective experience is echoed in numerous critiques. Walter Conn asserts that Fowler's claim that feeling is a central dimension of faith is expressed in development theory but not in the collection of data. In the actual analysis of a faith interview, affectivity is not scored. Conn does not see from the description of the aspects where affectivity is really included in the system (Conn, 1981a).

Further, an intense emotional experience of conversion is identified by Fowler as a content shift and not meaningful in itself for faith development. This signals a problem for Conn, who suggests that perhaps the affective aspect of faith has its own distinct structure (Conn, 1981a).

Sharon Parks has a similar interest in expanding Fowler's conception of faith to include the imagination along with the role of narrative that Fowler has already recognized. Fowler has responded to this by admitting that imagery is missing. He clarifies that this structural perspective does not attempt to include the totality of faith's expression and praxis, rather just the infrastructure (Dykstra, 1986, p. 138, 289).

A related critique is provided from the results of research with Hawaiian Buddhists. Randall Furishima has written that the seven aspects in Fowler's coding of faith stages do not adequately assess the faith of the subjects in his study who are artists or those who experience an exceptional depth in their cultural history. Furishima has recommended that "bounds of social awareness" be redefined to include social and historical faith identity, and that additional aspects be invented to assess a variety of creative reflections of faith (Furishima, 1985).

James Loder and J. Harry Fernhout ask a similar question about the arbitrariness of the seven aspects. Loder suggests the addition of aspects such as will and sense of humor. For Fernhout, the bounds of social awareness appears to be an extension of role-taking and therefore an unnecessary distinction. This kind of challenge may be easier to negotiate since Fowler himself added the aspect "locus of authority" in the interim after the initial research project and prior to 1976. Fowler himself has written that he is prepared to acknowledge more adequate categories for the structural analysis of faith (Fowler in Dykstra, 1986, p. 285).

The developmental construct itself also has received critical attention. Structural developmental theories standardly assert that stages are sequential, invariant, hierarchical and universal. Dykstra wonders about the possibility of regression in a sequential framework. Maria Harris also inquires about the fluidity of the stages especially in the circumstances of illiterate, retarded and very young candidates for faith development scoring (Harris in Dykstra, p. 122).

This issue of invariance and sequence in stage development represents a challenge from a whole spectrum of critics who suggest possible variations in sequence. While Fowler has claimed that an individual can display aspect scores that vary from their overall score, some researchers for example Furishima, have provided evidence of a range of more than two stages. Four of Furishima's interviews offer an example of this. While Furishima's interviews are only suggestive, an even more powerful critique concerning stage sequence has been launched by Carol Gilligan (Fowler, Moseley & Jarvis, 1986; Furishima, 1985).

Gilligan's work has been directed primarily toward Lawrence Kohlberg's moral development model. Nevertheless, it represents a challenge to all developmental models that do not attend to the unique patterns in the life span of women as distinct from

men. Gilligan's research takes a closer look at the moral stage scoring of women who initially appear to reach Kohlberg's fourth stage slower than do the men (Gilligan, 1982).

In a study that asks women their response to moral issues present in their own lives, Gilligan found women answering with an emphasis on responsibility and caring rather than the abstract principle of human rights. Gilligan's analysis portrays these two moral ideologies as approaching maturity from equally valid, complementary ethics, delivering each gender to full development. This challenges the identity-intimacy-generativity sequence that has rigidly defined the Erikson psychosocial development model and proposes that sequencing occurs differently according to gender (Gilligan, 1982, p. 164).

Fowler's theory of faith development, though born out of Kohlberg's moral development theory, avoids the technical pressure of Gilligan's criticism by factoring "bounds of social awareness" into his analysis of faith stages. Furthermore, Fowler, like Gilligan, inquires about real rather than hypothetical situations in the faith development interview. Fowler's work is, therefore, not as vulnerable to distorting stage analysis as Kohlberg's by the manner in which he collects and analyzes data. However, Carol Gilligan's

work presents a sociological challenge to take into account in constructing a research design and scoring procedure for both men and women. Her work forcefully suggests that the Erikson stages of identity and intimacy are reversed for women (Gilligan, 1982, p. 163; Yedwab, 1986, p. 46).

Sharon Parks offers another challenge to Fowler's invariant stage construction. Her research focuses on adolescent college students, a group that Fowler has labeled, "equilibrated transitionals," who are no longer conventionalists (Stage 3) but are not sufficiently individuated to be designated at Stage 4. Parks claims that this group represents a distinct and identifiable stage where self and society come into reflective focus, yet the presence of both cannot be simultaneously tolerated. There is, therefore, a rejection of one or the other, through political activism, juvenile delinquincy or meditation and affiliation with a cult. A separate study by Michael Shire among Jewish adolescents supports this notion of a separate stage (Yedwab, 1986, p. 47).

Discussions go on about structural theory and the problem that it is explicitly hierarchical. The theory suggests norms and evaluations of people for which religious educators like Gabriel Moran are uncomfortable. Fowler has very patiently described the

increasingly more adequate structures available in faith development stages and is careful not to imply that higher stage scorers are better people. That Moran has comprehended and re-stated this seeming paradox suggests that this issue is not a pressing problem in faith development work (Moran, 1983, p. 112).

What remains an assertion yet to be proven is the universal nature of human faith development. Cross-cultural research is just beginning and the data has not satisfied the questions of John Broughton or Furishima. Fowler's original research does favor white Christians: 97.8% are white, 81.5% Protestant or Catholic, 11.2% Jewish, 3.6% Orthodox (Christian), and 3.6% "other" (Fowler, 1981, p. 317). These critical perspectives correctly highlight the need for empirical studies that address the cross-cultural validity of faith development (Fowler, 1981, 317).

A very ambitious study has just been completed by John Snarey of the Center for Faith and Moral Development. This research attempts to evaluate the validity of Fowler's faith development construct by interviewing the founding members of an Israeli kibbutz who, after thirty years, personally represent three expressions of theistic and non-theistic Judaism (Snarey, 1990).

Snarey's research addresses four broad assumptions underlying Fowler's work which have been the focus of much of the above critiques about Fowler's theory. The assumption of universality was addressed by asking the researchable question, does the level of faith development among theists and non-theistic kibbutz founders significantly differ from the level of faith development among theists from other socio-religious groups. The sample showed that lower scores were determined by age or deficit characteristics (e.g. non-leaders, lower class, halfway house residents). Higher scores were consistent among older adults or elite sub-groups (e.g. leaders, upper-class professionals who by complexity of work developed beyond the norm). Snarey's study demonstrates that the faith of non-Christians and non-theists are scorable by Fowler's model (Snarey, 1990).

Fowler's claim of structural wholeness was also evaluated by measuring four indexes of internal consistency. The very same research study also assessed Fowler's contention that faith development encompasses moral development but is not solely determined by the level of moral development. Snarey's findings support Fowler's model in these two theoretical assumptions (Snarey, 1990).

Results were obtained by indicating positive and statistically significant correlations between faith development scores and both ego and moral development scores. The limited age range of the adult sample made stage score correlations with age unobtainable. Snarey cites secondary research analysis of Fowler's original 1981 sample to suggest that faith stage and age are strongly correlated during childhood and increasingly less strongly correlated during adulthood. This needs further study by longitudinal research designs to confirm the theoretical assumption of invariance in faith stages development (Snarey, 1990).

Snarey admits that his research cannot address the issue of invariance. The claim, however, for invariance is supported indirectly by faith development's significant correlation with both moral and ego development for which research has validated invariance in longitudinal studies. Post-hoc analysis of Snarey's study also shows no significant differences between men and women in faith development scores (Snarey, 1990).

Snarey's research is referred to here as a clarification of the current status of critical challenges to Fowler's theoretical model. This dialogue will no doubt continue and respond to Snarey's research. As of this writing, the publication of John

Snarey's latest work has only been in German, and by private, unpublished circulation in the United States in English.

Critical perspectives have also focused on the qualitative interview method of faith development research. C. Ellis Nelson and Daniel Aleshire outlines some of the biases which are inherent in the interview method. These include the effect of the interviewer and the effect of verbal and nonverbal expectations perceived by the interviewee, and the self-consciousness that may affect a research interview. All of these examples represent the possibility that subjects will modify their answers without a validity scale or control group to interpret the results (Nelson & Aleshire, in Dykstra, 1986, p. 180-84).

Carl Schneider has claimed that words are overvalued in Fowler's interview format. A trenchant analysis of the one and only faith development interview that Fowler has ever published, "Mary," demonstrates that Fowler mistakenly scored the subject at faith Stage 3 because he failed to see that Mary only used Stage 3 values in a jargoned vocabulary with the structural logic of Stage 2. In response to this criticism, Fowler reassessed his scoring and corrected it to Stage 2 (Fowler, in Dykstra, p. 292). Schneider

has asserted that the cause of this kind of error is the absence of an adequate instrument to monitor discrepancies between an individual's words, feelings and behavior (Schneider, in Dykstra, 1986).

Maria Harris is also concerned about the limitations of discursive responses for faith evaluation (Harris in Dykstra, p. 120). Broughton frames the problem succinctly when he questions whether Fowler's methodology is capable of distinguishing between real self and false self, actual beliefs and espoused beliefs, reflection or defense mechanism (Broughton, in Dykstra, pp. 92-93). Schneider echoes this problem by calling for a "hermeneutic of suspicion" (Schneider, in Dykstra, p. 240-241).

The problem with scoring "Mary's" interview emerged from Mary's intellectual ability to speak Stage 3 concepts while at the same time her life's issues and how she saw them and struggled with them indicated a Stage 2 way of being. The system of interpretation, then, needs to be attuned to these discrepancies. Schneider credits Fowler with redressing the classic psychoanalytic bias against religious experience, yet Schneider also perceives Fowler's method as unable to identify ego disorders or distortions of self. This is an effort to relate faith stages to the problem of sin. Fowler has carefully avoided the language of sin and

pathology, claiming that regression can occur only in the case of organic deterioration (Schneider, in Dykstra, p. 247).

This does not satisfy Schneider and Broughton who want some kind of analytic key to make distinctions between good and bad, conscious and unconscious. Fowler appears to be responding to this concern in his recent interest in Daniel Stern's work on infant-caretaker bonding. This refers to the nonverbal sense of self that develops from the particular attachment style of the mother and child. These earliest experiences are perceived as formative for how individuals trust, make contact and meaning in relationship. No doubt this new interest will effect new developments in Fowler's theory and methodology (Fowler in Blazer, 1989).

Another consistent theme among critics is the concern for how individuals' reflections about meaning are displayed in their actions. A similar objection to theory and method is raised in connection to Kohlberg's work. Fowler follows Kohlberg's assumption that there is a connection between knowing and acting. This remains an open question for many, and Carol Gilligan has been the most cogent voice on the subject of how a cognitive and hypothetical interview distorts the reality of what occurs when there is a crisis at hand.

This is partly redressed by the focus on real stories in the faith development interview that represent authentic investments in living. Yet, critics like Conn point out that during the interview, the cognitive process is in control of the description of feelings and motivations, and therefore he questions whether this provides direct access to the actuality of life. From a similar viewpoint, Broughton calls for an eighth aspect of faith stage evaluation, for an evaluation of action and motivation (Broughton in Dykstra, 1986, p. 103).

In suggesting this, Broughton considers the range of behavior that may be revealed in this kind of evaluation. People are not consistent, and stage scores are likely to encompass the entire range of stage behaviors up to the highest stage scored by an individual. Thus a Stage 4 person can revert to Stage 2 in a family reunion, or in a crisis a Stage 5 person can be motivated by Stage 1 or 2 (Broughton, in Dykstra).

Fowler has actually anticipated this phenomena and recognizes that each stage is comprised of all the preceding stages. This insight, however, may shift stages of faith development to states of being or paradigms of knowing. To have the structural potential for a given stage of faith development would not prove

that we can make consistent use of it. This would also provide an interpretation for how Mahatma Gandhi, who is identified by Fowler as a Stage 6 individual, would be able to apply a highly developed universal principle of understanding to an untouchable and something far less understanding to his wife and sons (Yedwab, 1986, p. 60).

The critical discussion continues and correctly highlights the need for empirical studies to address the concerns of this theoretical discussion. Clearly research has lagged far behind the theological and psychological conversation. Refinements are inevitable as specific groups, including adolescents, women, Buddhists, visual artists, and others test the power and generality of Fowler's model. New aspects may be distinguished that add precision and completeness to the assessment procedure (Snarey, 1990).

One such specific group is represented in the present study: Jewish women representing one psychosocial developmental phase. The purpose of this study is to test the theoretical relationship between Erik Erikson's lifecycle stages and Fowler's faith development stages. A relationship is one of the assumptions underlying Fowler's theory. The present

work is expressed as a psychometric hypothesis about intimacy and its relationship to faith development scores.

The Jewish Response to Fowler's Work

The selection of a cohort group of Jewish women invites an inquiry into the response of the Jewish community to Fowler's faith development work. The participants have been thoughtful as they seem to be responding to a perceived need in Jewish religious education to teach theological reflection appropriately, especially to higher level students. Fowler is seen as offering valuable strategies to religious educators that are effective for students at different levels of development.

The openness of this evaluation is not entirely surprising. Jewish educators have been utilizing Lawrence Kohlberg's process of moral dilemma discussions for stimulating moral development for more than a decade. A practical guide for Jewish teachers has been written that even includes Talmudic discussions of the specific dilemmas presented. The whole concept of development is endemic to Judaism so it is very natural for Jewish thinkers to incorporate modern variations on this principle of maturity and growth (Schwartz, 1983).

Development in ethical reasoning, however, may offer more obvious relevance to Jewish interests than distinctions about growth in faith. Some negotiating must go on at the initial phase of this Jewish encounter with Fowler. What is remarkable is that in spite of some concerns about where action fits into the faith scheme and the meaning of generic faith, two themes that Christian theologians have also voiced, Fowler's orientation about faith comes very close to the Hebraic meaning. No doubt this has encouraged Jewish exploration.

This was the conclusion of Rabbi Daniel Pressman who served as a theological resource person for one of the regional faith development conferences sponsored by Ken Stokes and the Religious Education Association. Pressman's impressions of Fowler's work includes relating Fowler's use of the word "faith" to the biblical understanding of faith (<u>emunah</u>) which is concerned with the quality of steadfastness and reliability in relationship. Pressman points out that in the Bible,

> God is an <u>El Emunah</u>, a reliable trustworthy God. The person with <u>emunah</u> returns that loyalty and trust in God. The Bible never speaks about God's existence. That was a given. <u>He'emin</u>, to believe, means as Berkovits writes, to put one's trust in something, to rely on him or on it... In the Bible, faith and belief are purely religious concepts describing a relationship of trust between God and man... In post-biblical (and post rabbinic) situations, Judaism did not develop a

philosophical approach that understood faith more
as belief in certain propositions, but the older
understandings of _emunah_ remains very important.
(Pressman, 1986, p. 2)

The inherent relational characteristic of Fowler's definition of faith and the active dimension of faith as a verb has been noticed and developed by all three Reform rabbis and scholars who have written about Fowler's faith development (Yedwab, 1986, p. 72).

Also interesting, is the influential advisor that appears on the thesis committee of two of the three major Jewish efforts at evaluating faith development. The advisor is none other than the esteemed Eugene Borowitz, professor at Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion, editor of Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Responsibility, and author of numerous books. This suggests that the reflection about faith development is not a tangential or eccentric interest, but rather an important concern given voice by respectable spokespersons.

Rabbi Paul Yedwab has written a very sensitive evaluation of faith development theory in his 1986 thesis. He depicts Fowler's work as a partner in the search for effective methods of transmitting tradition with the goal of encouraging faith development in the liberal, Jewish context beyond Stage 3 and 4. He draws the distinction, consistent with Fowler, that

developing structural competencies does not provide the content of religious education or theological understanding. This is the job of the religion whether it is through liturgy or classroom discussion or religious and social action by the rabbi or educator. Faith development, like Piaget's cognitive theory, is a guide for the structuring and evaluation of the learning of other content material (Yedwab, 1986, p. 100).

Yedwab appreciates the insights that Fowler can offer from a perspective of a lifelong progression of holistic development. Yedwab envisions this practical knowledge empowering Jewish educators in supporting and enriching their students' current development. He cites numerous applications for teachers and rabbis who naturally have the opportunity to interact with students and congregants during lifecycle crisis and transitions. Further, the explicit message from Fowler's work that faith is not separate from everyday, ordinary life is restated by Yedwab to encourage and enhance the functional capacity of educators and rabbis in talking about God and facilitating group discussions. Yedwab's thesis includes many concrete strategies for leading such discussions in the classroom, during worship services, and even more informal settings (Yedwab, 1986, p. 96).

At the heart of the thesis is a diagnosis of the Jewish community in terms of its predicament in Stage 3 and 4 stagnation. Any typical congregation, Yedwab asserts, relying on the work of Darryl Crystal and Ruth Haunz and the logic of faith development itself, is focused on the needs of individuals in Stage 3. There is a natural interlocking exchange between Stage 3 people and the external authority that organized religion represents. Stage 3 language, then, is central to the worship service with words like God is King, Father, Redeemer and Lawgiver. These images and corresponding modes of faith become inappropriate and dysfunctional for individuals at Stage 4 where the development of an executive ego internalized authority (Yedwab, 1986, p. 104).

Yedwab is using a faith development analysis to account for this disillusionment which is an experience reported by some people within the Jewish community. One strategy for interacting with Stage 3 - 4 transitionals who express disillusionment consists of developing educational exercises around prayer, Bible stories and moral dilemmas that explore and expand the imagery, symbols, locus of authority, explicit reasoning and third person perspective. The effect is likely to be a demythologizing of the Stage 3 religious content for some individuals and the realization of

new, personal meanings. The content of religion can thereby nurture Stage 4 and 5 individuals at their new level of maturity (Yedwab, 1986, p. 94).

Yedwab asserts that fully equilibrated Stage 4 development is more typical of liberal Jews with their profile of rationalistic, individuative reflection. This stage, he says, occurs earlier than even Fowler has predicted, due to the complexity of this community which is generally highly educated and philosophically sophisticated. At some point in mature adulthood, this audience needs to break through to a partnership of logic and conviction in order to develop a higher Stage 5 structure of faith which appreciates dialectic, the paradox of a leap of faith (Yedwab, pp. 103, 110).

Resources for Stage 4 are available in the work of Martin Buber, Mordecai Kaplan, and Hermann Cohen, and for Stage 5, in the work of the distinguished Leo Baeck, "who strove to heal the dialectic between the rationalistic God of ethical monotheism and the personal God of the human soul" (Yedwab, p. 73). These Jewish thinkers are more sophisticated than what is commonly available at worship services. Yedwab devotes a chapter in his thesis to each of these theologians and an analysis of what stage they express and their overall compatability with the Protestant, structural-developmentalist, James Fowler.

Yedwab points out that both the Reform and Reconstructionist movement within Judaism have revised their liturgy to reflect advanced levels of modern faith. What Fowler's work offers is a paradigm that appreciates not only the disillusionment and demythologizing of Stage 4, but the second naivete and reappropriation of symbols in Stage 5. Thus our attention to master stories and their meaning and power at each stage of life is the content of faith. Faith development theory is a tool for understanding and facilitating the natural course of maturity over a lifetime (Yedwab, 1986, p. 105).

Yedwab sees Stage 5 as a normative goal for the liberal Jewish community. This is consistent with Fowler's description of Stage 6 as an extraordinary and unlikely accomplishment for most people. Beyond that reasoning, Stage 5 truly represents a transcendence of the isolated rationalism that constrains the Jewish community's creative appropriation of its rich heritage (Yedwab, p. 103).

This goal and perspective is shared by Rabbi Neil Gillman at the Conservative Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. Gillman conceptualizes the project in terms of Fowler's stages in personal conversation, yet holds Fowler's stage theory in the background and in the footnotes of his published work. He sees the

project in the Jewish community as one of negotiating the move from Stage 4 to Stage 5. Gillman indicates that he has undergone the process himself and it is a rewarding journey (Gillman, 1990b).

The literary, critical examination of biblical writings effectively breaks the myth of the tradition. What most lay people feel intuitively from living in the secular, critical, scientific milieu of the last three generations, rabbis learn methodically in the study of Scriptures, that the naive traditional interpretations are unworkable for contemporary life. However, congregational rabbis are sent out to the field and are expected to be inside the myth as a leader for their constituency. This naturally involves a painful tension and isolation (Gillman, 1989).

In Fowler's stage terms, this means liberal rabbis are probably personally developed to at least Stage 4 and performing for their congregation at a level of Stage 3. Even when congregations are already at Stage 4, Gillman's solution involves inviting everyone to the level of Stage 5 by an additional interpretative step in understanding tradition.

Referring to Paul Ricoeur and Martin Buber, Gillman realizes that while the initial, modern reading of Scripture is a scientific and critical undertaking which is without doubt an epistemological breakthrough

that has accomplished our Stage 4 development, Stage 5 is possible through an I-Thou conversion. This simply means that the distance that Stage 4 creates can be bridged by a secondary movement of intimacy (Gillman, 1990b).

The Pentateuch is a rich, complex product of human hands, created in a community which offers a profound symbolic reality that does not imply anything fictional. Understanding is accomplished by imaginative reconstruction of what was intended by the historical community. This entails reaching out in an entirely new way that involves complex psychic processes as well as objective, historical observation. Tradition becomes a matter of how the historical community has understood itself in its texts in different generations, and how the present context invites interaction with the text about self, community and world. This is a more enriched experience than identification with the text or alienation from the tradition (Gillman, 1990b).

Gillman approximates that about half a dozen faculty members and one-third of the students at the seminary are interested in his work. He suggests about 15% are uncomfortable and actively resist this kind of agenda (Gillman, 1990b).

Gillman is not appropriating Fowler's work without critique. In fact, he intends to offer a serious reflection on Fowler's theory in the next year. In conversation, he suggests two important themes he will develop further. One relates to the difference between Jewish and Christian faith especially the prominence given to action and observance in Judaism. Secondly, he points to the difference in Jewish and Christian concepts of relationship. For Jews, Gillman declares, relationship is family much more so than for Christianity. He suggests that Fowler's relationship-oriented faith is a Tillichian version that is somehow different. Gillman promises to elaborate on these ideas in his next book (Gillman, 1990b).

The work of James Fowler for Gillman is pioneering. He sees expressions of faith Stage 5 development occurring in Lawrence Hoffman's work, <u>Beyond the Text: A Holistic Approach to Liturgy</u>. Indeed liturgy, Gillman says, is where canonization continues in the present. The article, "Inside or Outside? Emancipation and the Dilemmas of Conservative Judaism," records the Stage 5 transition occurring at Jewish Theological Seminary which promises a level of satisfaction within the Jewish community that has been

missing for quite a while. For Gillman, Fowler's vocabulary is clearly a principal language for conceptualizing this transformation (Gillman, 1989).

Michael Shire has written a Masters' thesis about adolescent faith development with a concern, much like Yedwab and Gillman, for facilitating the development of faith in the Jewish community. Shire addresses both the absence of theological education for young people and the requirements of that kind of education for an effective sponsorship of faith development (Shire, 1983, p. 53).

He is completely satisfied by the current official Reform Jewish theology, as well as its view of theological instruction, because it enables adolescents to explore and synthesize personal belief from a rich and diverse spectrum of possibilities in a non-directive atmosphere where doubt is appreciated and differing points of view can be validated. This, Shire perceives, is both theologically and psychologically sound (Shire, 1983, p. 51).

However, the official Reform (U.A.H.C.) position about theological instruction has not always provided a syllabus for teaching a God-concept nor methods for implementing a theological curriculum. Shire recounts the development of this agenda in three periods of American Reform Jewish history. First, from 1937 to

1956 the official curricula did not include any theological teaching. In 1957 theological concerns were verbalized but because there were too many theological points of view in the Reform movement, the curriculum was not able to designate particular theological goals for specific grades or ages. In 1960, the matter of a teaching method for theology was explicitly included for the first time. In reporting this new paragraph in the curriculum that introduces the concept of indirect theological instruction, Shire adds his view that this was entirely inadequate to provide the opportunity for "a full and ego-fulfilling integration." It was in 1977 that Eugene Borowitz addressed the problem boldly enough, from Shire's point of view, and redesigned classroom learning and stated explicit criteria for instruction (Shire, p. 54).

Matching this official agenda with what is actually going on in Jewish religious instruction, Shire reports that theology is infrequently taught and often delayed until tenth grade when rabbis typically lead the class. When classroom theological talk does take place, teachers frequently violate the non-directive mode by engaging in one-way classroom conversation. These assertions are made by Shire based on independent studies by Gertman and Syme (Shire, 1983, p. 56).

This one-way process of discussion fails to develop mutual interpersonal perspective-taking which in itself fosters a transcendence of egocentrism, and a third person perspective which can develop further into an ability to distinguish differing contexts and systems that operate simultaneously. Even group discussion where the teacher's role is a respondent to students' doubt fails to develop student resources. The process of discussion must parallel the new stage structure in order to contribute to its unfolding.

Shire, here, is using Fowler's aspect of perspective-taking as a criterion for analyzing and critiquing curricular material. He pursues this with all seven aspects of faith development, adjusting stage characteristics to the "young adult" stage level. He applies this assessment criterion to a series of instructional materials designed for this age group.

The results of his analysis reveal that religious educational materials consistently cover: bounds of social awareness, locus of authority, and frequently cover form of logic, perspective-taking, and forms of moral judgment. Two neglected aspects are form of world coherence and symbolic function. This analysis matches Shire's empirical study of nineteen randomly selected fourteen-year-olds whose faith stage scores reveal a proportionally lower score in the aspect of

symbolic function than other aspects. This confirms a need for educational attention to this area in order to support the integration of more mature faith. Shire suggests supplementary materials to address these aspects (Shire, 1983, p. 85).

Another Jewish religious educator and graduate student of Fowler, Roberta Louis Goodman, is conducting research in faith development. While she has not published or completed a thesis, she has consulted with a number of people in the Jewish community who are interested in faith development. She has also presented seminars about Fowler's work at the yearly Conference on Alternatives in Jewish Education (C.A.J.E.) focusing on redefining the goals of Hebrew and Sunday School and remodeling programs for youngsters as well as young adults in the light of what faith development reveals about age-appropriate learning.

In an unpublished paper entitled "In Search of Meaning: Faith Development Theory and Judaism" (1986), Goodman represents her confidence in applying Fowler's theory to the concerns of the Jewish community. Goodman uses Fowler's stage descriptions as a diagnostic tool for characteristic problems of different stages and this she believes is relevant to the work of counselors as well as educators. Goodman

also uses faith development theory as an interpretive key for Scripture which she demonstrates in a discussion about Job and his friends and their views on justice. Goodman's enthusiasm for Fowler's work is unlimited as she states clearly how much more it offers Jewish education than Piaget and Kohlberg's work and how many sorts of ordinary life challenges it is capable of addressing (Goodman, 1986).

Goodman realizes that faith development theory is no substitute for a Jewish education (p. 26). At the same time, she virtually prooftexts the construction of the theory in terms of its congruence and therefore compatability with Judaism. This includes the themes of

1. Faith is a verb.

2. It is universal and personal.

3. Faith involves loyalty, commitment and values, therefore representing a way of being, a lifestyle, and not limited to a set of beliefs or propositions.

4. Faith is relational, which means covenantal. Fowler himself uses the word covenant to describe the inherent nature of faith.

5. Drawing on Michael Shire's work and research into etymology, Goodman illuminates the root meaning of faith in Hebrew, _emunah_, meaning "trust, faithfulness, standing firm, steadfastness." Sharing

the same root is _omenet_ or "wet nurse," meaning "to confirm or support;" _omenet_ is similar in etymology to _ema_ or "mother." This suggests the relational background of the actual word for faith and parallels Fowler's use of the word and his description of the pre-verbal stages. Goodman also asserts that the Hebrew _emunah_ refers to human relatedness as well as God's relationship to humanity. Fowler's concept of faith, then, matches the Hebraic understanding of faith.

6. Goodman notes Fowler interviews a proportional number of Jews in his research, and

7. Fowler's relational paradigm matches Martin Buber's _I and Thou_ without falling into the trap of an individualism that prevents community.

This enthusiasm for Fowler's work is matched by many other Jewish graduate students. Sarah Lee, Director of the School of Religious Education at the Hebrew Union College in Los Angeles disclosed in an interview (Lee, 1990) that faith development theory has, "a lot of currency among sophisticated students because of its generic orientation." Lee adds that faith may look different at the higher stages of development in different religions. She suggests that this is implied in the articles about adult development in differing cultures and religions in the edited volume devoted to Erikson's work (1978). She suggests

some possible differences may be reflected in the textual and sacramental emphases in the Roman Catholic and Jewish traditions that may differ from the Protestant. This is a theoretical discussion about what different values and behaviors are produced by different religions.

Interestingly, Fowler himself has prepared a description of the stages of faith and how Jewish tradition may be appropriated at each stage (Fowler, 1987b). Stage 6, Fowler suggests, may present itself in the form of a contemporary tsadik whose life is grounded in God's will, and who is experienced as an authentic spiritual leader by the transformation that occurs in the inner self of those who come into the tsadik's presence. At the same time, this tsadik (translation, "righteous one") is very much an ordinary human being. Fowler has distinguished a possible profile of a higher stage of faith development for a Jewish individual, thus suggesting that he expects individuating styles of high development and not conformity (Fowler, 1987b).

This chapter has presented Fowler's theory and research tool as well as the critical assessment from Christian religious educators, psychologists and Jewish religious educators. Many of these concerns have been part of an ongoing dialogue with Fowler, and faith

development theory and assessment has been clarified on some points. Many of these concerns await empirical confirmation.

This review of literature is not complete without referring to the work accomplished by Kenneth Stokes, Constance Leean, Gwen Hawley and the Religious Education Association along with The Princeton Religion Research Center, an Affiliate of the Gallup Organization and George Gallup, Jr. This extensive project includes two modules. The first was undertaken by Gallup as a telephone survey of approximately thirty questions to 1042 respondents. The second was intended as a faith development study that utilized the in-depth, qualitative interview and analysis of 41 subjects: 18 men and 23 women. The focus of both parts of this study was defined in terms of seven hypotheses that were translated into researchable questions which yielded interesting findings. The core of the study was aimed at clarifying the theoretical relationship between psychosocial lifecycle development and structural-developmental faith development.

The following hypotheses were addressed in the adult developmental research:

1. The dynamics of faith development are different for men and women.

2. Faith development does not occur at a

consistent rate or in a uniform way throughout adulthood, but rather in varying patterns of activity and quiescence directly related to specific chronological periods in the adult life cycle.

3. There is a relationship between periods of transition, change, and crisis in one's life and his/her faith development.

4. Faith development is positively related to involvement in social issues and concerns.

5. Faith development involves struggle leading to both cognitive and affective change.

6. Faith development is positively related to one's involvement in educational experiences. The overall finding of the study suggests a positive relationship between Erikson's psychosocial stage growth and Fowler's structural faith development (Religious Education Association, 1987, p. 5).

In addition to the publication of this research, there is also a companion publication by the same name, Faith Development in the Adult Life Cycle (Stokes, 1983), that records the collegial interactions with Fowler. These conferences were very productive in providing Fowler with forums for clarifying and responding to many theoretical and practical concerns. Fowler's response to the project underlines the

problems he sees from not distinguishing clearly between psychosocial and structural development theories.

Focus of the Literature Review

Since the publication of the Module I and II research that Kenneth Stokes supervised with Constance Leean and Gwen Hawley as project leaders, a surprising lack of reference is made to it in the literature about faith development. (See Religious Education Association, Faith Development in the Adult Life Cycle for a report on Module I and Module II.) No current reference is made to this research in the material that comes from Fowler's Center for Faith and Moral Development in Atlanta. An investigation into the design and results of the Module I and II studies reveals a problem in not consistently distinguishing the psychosocial and structural theories of development. The discussion is riddled with confusion about what faith development involves. For example, the analysis of scores frequently includes the individual's self-perception of faith change which is a self-report procedure utilized in the Module I Gallup telephone study of 1042 people and carried over into the Model II structural and psychosocial study for the purpose of its potential feedback on the meaning of the Module I study.

The researchers admit that they were aware that their subjects were confused about the notion of "faith development" in the self-report inventory. This is understandable given its complexity, even for academics. They therefore established definitions for the terms used in their questioning process. These definitions do not accurately reflect the structural component which distinguishes the faith development theory from the psychosocial theory:

> FAITH DEVELOPMENT: The dynamics by which a person finds and makes meaning of life's significant questions and issues, adheres to this meaning, and acts it out in his or her life span.
>
> FAITH: The finding and making meaning of life's significant questions and issues, adhering to this meaning, and acting it out.
>
> ADULT LIFE CYCLE: The changing patterns of physical, psychological and social change which occur in adulthood from the transition out of adolescence through midlife and older adulthood to death. (Religious Education Association, 1987, Module II, p. 4)

This definition of faith development does not present the multiple transformations of integrated meaning that an individual may live through in the course of a lifetime, and this dynamic of changing structures which is at the core of structural development. "The dynamics by which a person finds and makes meaning" can also be understood to apply to the resolution of Erikson's identity stage of late

adolescence. The statement therefore is unclear about what dynamic it is referring to as the quest for meaning.

The study states that these self-reports were more likely a measure of faith change than faith development which supports the notion that the method of self-report with or without the above definitions is likely to invite information about changes in the contents of faith only. Yet these separate sources of information are combined in the discussion, leading to inferences about lifecycle chronology as predictors for structural stage faith development. This confuses the interpretation of what the actual faith stage structural scores mean. Pages are given to asserted relationships between perceived faith changes and key life events, but these are not the result of any kind of factor analysis involving structural stage scoring. The relationships are concluded by synthesizing the results of both psychosocial and structural scores along with the self-reports of individuals who themselves are struggling with the structural terminology (Religious Education Association, pp. 24, 33-34).

Another confusion is suggested by a paragraph included in the description of Eriksonian psychosocial theory.

> Based in psychoanalytic ego psychology, Erikson
> moved beyond Freud by emphasizing the
> meaning-making function in personality
> development. Erikson saw this as a dynamic
> interaction between the person and the environment
> where the ego attempts to accommodate and
> assimilate new understandings which emerge from
> life events and life contexts. He set this
> psychosocial understanding into a stage theory,
> involving successive evolutions of self-other
> relating (Religious Education Association, 1987
> Module II, p. 13).

This appears to be a conflation of ego psychological terms with Piagetian cognitive terms. Erikson's stages are attributed a meaning-making function which is true to some degree, but more fundamentally true of a structural development agenda. Also, the process of development for Erikson is described in the Piagetian terminology of "accommodation and assimilation" instead of reflecting his appropriation of his Freudian background in conflict theory by the use of words such as "conflict" and "resolution."

Fowler's response to the Module I and II studies is recorded in the post-study national conference transcripts that were published by Stokes (1983). Fowler's presentation is dominated by his focus on distinguishing the psychosocial theory from structural stage theory. He painstakingly draws out the theoretical difference between these two theories without saying directly that he is disappointed or disapproving of the research.

This is where he states that psychosocial stages are "orderly and sequential stages that occur naturally with the passage of time." Further, these predictable maturational challenges are necessary factors in development, but are not by themselves sufficient for facilitating structural-developmental changes. This is where Fowler describes how structural development reaches into "a priori categories of thought" which underlie experience (Fowler, in Stokes, 1983, p. 183). The structure of a person's mind, by definition, is not directly available to his or her experience. These comments appear to refer to the confusion of these two theories in the Module II study. They refer to the futility of asking for self-reports of structural stage faith development and interpreting them as valid correlations with actual structural stage growth (Fowler, in Stokes, 1983, p. 183-4).

Fowler's subsequent book, published one year later, restates and amplifies this theme. He credits Don Browning's work for his renewed appreciation of Erikson and the ethical vision implied in Erikson's psychosocial perspective of adult maturity. Fowler paraphrases Erikson's psychosocial stages with a respectful awareness of the rich tensions of each stage that press for resolution. When successful, these predictable developmental crises generate strengths and

virtues that form and reform an individual throughout the lifecycle and enable a fulfillment of personal wholeness and an ethical society (Fowler, 1984, p. 30).

In discussing lifecycle theories, Fowler relates Erikson's ethical perspective of a fulfilled life as a life lived in caring for the generativity of self and others and a care for life itself, with an affinity to the prophetic literature of the Bible. Drawing out the metaphor, Fowler perceives the work of Daniel Levinson on lifecycle development as comparable to the wisdom literature, especially Ecclesiastes 3:1-8 which starts, "There is an appointed time for everything." This catches the spirit of Levinson's evolving life journey that changes in twenty year increments. Each season is characterized by differing patterns of relationships and roles that constitute a life structure that is tied to biological and social time (Fowler, 1984, p. 32).

Levinson's work, however, is distinct from Erikson's. For the developmental passage relating to intimacy, Erikson portrays the challenge of building a relationship and persevering through conflict and struggle to communion of the two identities. Failure to resolve this challenge produces profound separation or fusion; success creates the virtue of love. In

contrast, Levinson's version of the accomplishment of intimacy is the utilitarian matter of getting married (Fowler, 1984, p. 25).

Fowler's comparison of Erikson and Levinson demonstrates his thoughtful attention to psychosocial theory as well as his high esteem for Erikson. Yet this does not diminish his declaration that the theoretical differences between psychosocial development and structural faith development must be honored theoretically and empirically. What is important and interesting is how these two developmental paradigms interact.

Fowler has written that the interplay of psychosocial challenges and structural developmental stages of faith shapes the character of the psychosocial passage. For example, the later the transition into the individuative-reflective style of faith is delayed in adult life, the more disruptive it is likely to be to commitments in work, relationship and community. This is due to the profound new depth of questioning and reorientation about self and others. This can easily cause dramatic upsets in relationships and actually precipitate psychosocial crisis (Fowler, in Stokes, 1983, p. 197).

The same structural developmental step in a person's twenties probably threatens far fewer commitments and promises. Belated transitions meet more obstacles. Fowler states in 1983 that his preliminary research suggests that if the transition from conventional faith Stage 3 to the individuative-reflective faith Stage 4 does not occur by midlife, there is far less chance of it occurring at all. These speculations, of course, await confirmation from longitudinal studies (Fowler, in Stokes, 1983, p. 196).

Another study that focuses the relationship between psychosocial changes and structural development is Richard Shulik's research on aging and faith development. Shulik studied 40 individuals ages 60 years or older with the structural interview as well as with projective tests to measure what Shulik calls "age-sense." By the term age-sense, Shulik means a person's perceptions of the aging process. He finds that individuals who have accomplished higher stages of faith development are far more sensitive to internal and external changes which accompany aging than the individuals in his study at lower stages. The higher faith stage persons were more adept at introspection,

and they perceived the environment as more fluid, less rigid. Further, Shulik asserts, they were noticeably happier (Shulik, 1979, pp. 162, 166).

Fowler interprets this research to suggest that the psychosocial lifecycle experience of aging is not the same experience for persons in Stage 3 as it is for persons in Stage 5. Lifecycle transitions may be qualitatively different for different people depending on their structural development. This has led Fowler to suggest an optimal or ideal schedule for faith development stages (Fowler, in Stokes, 1983, p. 198).

Fowler suggests the ideal schedule for structural development during Erikson's psychosocial stages of infancy, childhood and adolescence is the structural stage development of the intuitive-projective faith during early childhood, mythic-literal faith during primary school and the synthetic-conventional faith during adolescence. These eras and stages incorporate rapid and dramatic changes, indeed revolutions, between the years from birth to twenty-two and prepare the young adult for the individuative-reflective stage which is ideally suited to the tasks and challenges of the first adult era (Fowler, in Stokes, 1983, p. 199).

Clearly, many children do not experience structural stage development transitions on this timetable. Development can arrest or proceed slower.

Fowler has reported adults best described by the structure of Stage 2. He has also admitted that the synthetic-conventional faith Stage 3, which typically takes form during adolescence, becomes a stable, life-long structural style for many adults. Likewise, Stage 4 which is formed in the twenties and thirties can also become a permanent stage orientation. Fowler goes on to speculate that the work of midlife transition is best accomplished when it at least includes or corresponds to a Stage 4, and preferably a Stage 5 transition in faith also (Fowler, in Stokes, 1983, pp. 195-97).

This discussion enriches the possibilities for understanding the interaction between psychosocial and structural stages. Psychosocial stages appear to sequence with time as individuals move from adolescence through adulthood and old age. Persons move through the stages almost regardless of their life situation or personal efforts to grow. In contrast, structural changes focus on a qualitative restructuring of self and world that is stimulated by life's dissonances and challenges; structural changes also require the individual's readiness to do this kind of personal work. Structural stage growth is therefore not tied to an external timetable (Fowler, in Stokes, 1983, p. 199).

Structural-developmental change does not unfold automatically with the passing of time. This qualitative restructuring is related to the individual's use of experience, the way he or she manages the major issues of career, love, and mortality. The resourcefulness of a person and its impact on identity and meaning-making during the experiences of marriage, parenting, career advancement and decline, and so forth, will construct different developmental outcomes (Fowler, in Stokes, 1983, p. 199).

The stage structures of knowing and valuing organizes the content of life experience and provides a level of awareness, responsibility and power that can be applied to the challenge of psychosocial stage transition. The level of these operations, then, determines the quality of the self-reflection and perspective-taking of others that in turn affects the degree to which psychosocial development is enhanced (Fowler, in Stokes, 1983, p. 201).

A lot of interpretations about psychosocial stages and faith development have come out of the Module II phase of Kenneth Stokes' study. Constance Leean, the research project leader of that study, has suggested that the successful resolution of the early midlife challenge of intimacy versus isolation appears to

correlate with the breakthrough to Stage 5 in faith development (Leean, 1988, pp. 576-80). Leean's approach to the study of structural development expresses an interest in enhancing faith development by supporting and facilitating psychosocial resolution in the hope that such an effort will produce the spiritual maturity of Stage 5.

As a strategy, this offers the potential for utilizing accessible vehicles such as conventional counseling as a resource for faith development. Therefore Leean's study emphasizes the psychological adjustments and unresolved emotional issues associated with structural stage score results. Leean writes in her research report:

> One significant finding from the Erikson analysis is that the most frequent unresolved or negatively resolved life cycle conflict is "Intimacy vs. Isolation" with 2/3 of these falling within the 25 to 45 age range. From the Erikson analysis, it is likely that this particular psychosocial and affective tension ties up energy that could result in a major obstacle to faith development. (Religious Education Association, Module II, p. 45).

Leean's perspective consistently looks for the psychosocial variables that may be related to faith development. In a more recent article, Leean writes:

> A thread running through these shifts from Stage 4 and 5 is the ability or willingness to step outside one's own boundaries and become vulnerable to truths and claims of persons and groups from other traditions or experiences. In essence, this is an intimacy vs. isolation challenge. (Leean, 1988, p. 581)

Statement of the Problem

Theoretically, a relationship exists. Intimacy is incorporated profoundly into the fabric of the Stage 5 description by Fowler where it does not appear in Stage 4. The question is whether the successful resolution of the intimacy versus isolation psychosocial crisis is a necessary and sufficient condition for Stage 5 development. This dissertation seeks to clarify the empirical relationship between psychosocial and structural theory by focusing on the intimacy resolution scale for middle-aged adults and comparing their scores with the results of their structural faith stage development.

My research questions are the following:

(1) Do individuals who have been successful in resolving intimacy versus isolation, score higher in faith development than individuals who have not been successful in resolving intimacy versus isolation?

(2) If individuals score at Stage 5 in faith development, what are their scores on the psychosocial scale for intimacy?

Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study is posed as follows: A trend of correspondence will be found between the successful resolution of the psychosocial challenge of intimacy versus isolation and higher stages of faith development in a cohort group of middle-aged women. Specifically, the research question that will be explored statistically is, does a middle-aged group of high psychosocial scoring women in one particular scale also score higher in faith development than a group of low psychosocial scoring women.

CHAPTER 3

Method

Setting

The Temple where this study was conducted is located in southern Orange County, California. It was founded in 1981 by a group of largely transplanted Jews from other parts of the country who, as adults with young children, wanted the facilities and services of a Reform congregation. While there are other congregations in south Orange County, this is the first and only Reform community.

The current Rabbi has been serving for the last six years and is very popular. The congregation has been growing, and one major project it has undertaken is the purchase of land to build its own facility. Acquisition of the land has been accomplished and the remaining goal is scheduled for completion in three years. The congregation currently meets in a church facility.

At the outset of this study, random names were selected from the membership roster of 257 member families. Letters requesting participation were sent out to the women in 138 of these member families. The membership roster includes predominantly two-parent families which are either intact, nuclear families or

remarried, blended families. Other family units include older couples whose children are adults and no longer in the home, as well as some single parent households.

The age range of the adult congregation spans the entire adult lifecycle. However, there are larger numbers of middle-aged adults in the 30 to 50 year age range. Many member families include spouses who are not Jewish. These spouses participate to whatever degree they choose. All religious and social activities are open except for congregational voting. There are also a growing number of Jewish partners who have converted from other religions by a prescribed process of classwork and personal preparation. This distribution of Jews by choice and non-Jews in a Reform synagogue is a common feature in current American synagogue participation. What distinguishes this southern Orange County community is its youthful population. Compared to older, more established communities, one is not likely to find three generations of the same family in close, residential proximity here.

The Temple presents itself to the community as a full-service synagogue offering religious school education to children from pre-kindergarten to tenth grade as well as for adults, regular Friday night

Sabbath and Bar/Bat Mitzvah services and training for adult Bar and Bat Mitzvah as well as holiday workshops and celebration. There are also youth activities, a sisterhood, Havurah (friendship) groups and a choir. Special projects include supporting newly arrived immigrant Soviet families into this community and assisting larger numbers of Soviet Jews immigrating to Israel.

These programs are very well attended, education especially being highly prized in the community. The socio-economic setting of this group is largely upper-middle class consisting of a high number of professionals and business owners with at least a college education. The Rabbi has a background as a college instructor in history and his public self-expression seems to match the level of interests and sophistication of the congregation.

<u>Selection Procedure</u>

The subjects were chosen by random sample from the Temple computer mailing list of Temple members provided by the secretary at the office of the Rabbi. The use of the Temple membership roster for this purpose was approved by prior arrangement with the Rabbi and Temple President, and the cover letter to prospective subjects informed them of this authorization.

The mailing directory consisted of twenty-four pages of eleven family names and addresses in mailing label form that appear in a vertical list. The random sample process consisted of selecting from a bag, one token at a time, the number on the token designating which name on the page was sent a letter by its numerical position in the row. The same number was used for each page and then the token was returned to the bag and the next token was drawn. The number on the token then determined which name of the remaining uncontacted names were selected. The higher numbered tokens were eliminated as the list of uncontacted members became shorter. A total of 138 names were selected and questionnaires and paper and pencil answer sheets were mailed along with a cover letter requesting participation.

The choice was made early in the design of this study to request participation of only female subjects. The rationale for using only one gender comes from the observed and theoretical variations that are apparent in the development of men and women over the course of the lifecycle. Choosing one gender with such a small sample offers to eliminate the distraction that variations in Stage 3 and Stage 4 development with these two groups might produce due to gender-related differences.

The selection of females was also based on the expectation of higher subject compliance among women due to greater time availability, a greater social tendency to cooperate, the current cultural interest in women's development, and the commonality of gender with the researcher. Therefore, the questionnaires and cover letters were addressed to the woman in the family on the membership list.

Sixty-seven answer sheets were returned, signed and dated with education and marital status listed in all but three where only the name and date were reported. The subjects' ages ranged rom 27 to 70; the median age was 42. Five subjects identified themselves in one or another non-married status: one single, one separated, three divorced. The rest reported marriage. Five subjects listed completion of high school, three others added some vocational or business school training, fourteen subjects reported some college, seventeen were college graduates, ten described additional credits beyond college, and fifteen disclosed completed graduate degrees.

Contact had been made without regard to visible religious participation, ethnic identification or formal conversion. One telephone inquiry was received from a prospective subject about participating as a

non-converted member of the congregation. The researcher encouraged participation in order to support random sampling.

The matter of formal Jewish status was not factored into the design of the study. The intended scope of this research was defined in terms of a Reform Jewish congregation. This means a focus on a representative group of people that a Reform Rabbi is likely to serve in the course of his duties in the congregation. This eliminates, for example, unaffiliated Jews, Jews who belong to a Jewish Community Center rather than a synagogue, as well as members of Conservative and Orthodox congregations.

Therefore, participants in the random sample were not questioned about their official religious identity. The letter requesting participation was addressed to "Temple Member," and the purpose of studying a Jewish congregation was explicitly stated in the letter. All returned questionnaires, then, were included in the study.

In all three cases of known non-Jews in the random sample, participation in the congregation is extremely active. Since none of the questionnaires or interviews are anonymous, the mixture of affiliation and formal religious identification can be analyzed and sorted out at a later time.

Letters with questionnaires were sent out in batches starting August 7, September 27, October 6, October 20 and November 6, 1989. Random selection procedure and mailings were discontinued after the goal of sixty returned answer sheets was accomplished. The earliest answer sheets received were dated September 28, the latest, November 28, 1989.

Answer sheets were immediately scored to determine eligibility for faith development interviewing. Letters of gratitude to all participants were mailed by December 29, 1989. Letters were also sent on December 29, 1989 to participants who requested the results of their questionnaire, and on January 5, 1990 to persons who qualified as high and low scorers inviting participation in phase two, the Faith Development Interview.

Included with the letter to prospective phase two participants was a copy of the Life Tapestry Exercise directions and worksheet, and preparatory assignment that is part of Fowler's protocol which is based on the journaling process developed by Ira Progoff. The letter disclosed the general faith development focus of the study and its intention to provide the synagogue-affiliated population with feedback for future program development.

Also, the interview process and scoring was described and confidentiality was promised. Underlined in the letter was a statement clarifying and highlighting the research purpose of the interview and disclaiming any clinical agenda. This was perceived as a necessary statement for a project undertaken by a researcher with a clinical license communicating on professional stationary.

The random sample of 138 women resulted in 67 responses. These 67 subjects were scored on all psychosocial scales and the 8 highest intimacy scorers and the 9 lowest intimacy scorers were invited to participate in the faith development interview. The project called for 5 high and 5 low scorers. The first 5 in each group who responded to the written and telephone invitations for the semi-clinical interview were scheduled.

<u>Instruments</u>

The psychosocial questionnaire used to score Erik Erikson's psychosocial development was published in 1988 by Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. in Odessa, Florida, and represents the work of Gwen Hawley in her 1984 dissertation for the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill. It is known and published as

a psychosocial measure based on Eriksonian theory. Its connection to a theoretical model invites a variety of uses including clinical, research and education.

The instrument, Measures of Psychosocial Development (MPD), is written at a sixth grade reading level and can be completed in fifteen to twenty minutes. The results are reported as T-scores or percentiles and are plotted by sex and age groups ranging from thirteen years old to fifty plus. This means that participants in this study aged 25-49 were plotted on norms that varied from the age group fifty years and older. Differences in male and female norms have been eliminated by the selection of an exclusively female sample.

The scores consist of twenty-seven scales which represent the issues and dynamics of personality outlined by Erik Erikson's psychosocial stage theory. Each stage involves the conflict of a positive and negative orientation that struggles for resolution during that stage. The MPD measures the positive and negative attitudes associated with each stage and the current status of conflict resolution at each stage. There is also an index of overall psychosocial health. In sum, there are eight positive scales, eight negative scales, eight resolution scales and three summary scales: positive, negative and resolution. The

resolution scale presents not only the degree of resolution but also the direction, positive or negative, of resolution.

The MPD contains 112 items that are answered by a response on a five-point scale ranging from "very much like me," to "not at all like me." The scores were normed on a primarily white sample of 2480 males and females. Test-retest reliability coefficients for the MPD scales are reported in the Manual (PAR, 1980) uniformly at .80 with one exception of .67. The construct validity for the MPD was established in a series of multitrait-multimethod analyses and is also reported in the Manual.

The Faith Development Interview was conducted according to the guidelines in the Manual for Faith Development Research (Fowler, 1986b). This is the most recent Manual of faith development interviewing and represents a significant advance over the initial guide that was made available by the Center for Faith and Moral Development in 1983.

The interview protocol calls for an informal, conversational atmosphere where the Life Tapestry is first reviewed and the five or six marker events that have been life-shaping are briefly sketched. While this chronicling exercise was requested, it was not communicated by this researcher as mandatory. As a

result, three   subjects completed the worksheet, and three thought about it; the remaining subjects omitted this step.

The researcher perceived one of the values of this Life Tapestry phase as a mood-creator where a deeper form of conversation is invited. This exercise was uniformly recalled in the initial phase of each interview intentionally by the interviewer and reviewed as a recommended exercise with specific features. This process of referring to the exercise elicited a transition into a more reflective conversation. This warming-up is the explicit intention of the Tapestry according to the Manual (Fowler, 1986b).

The actual, prescribed, semi-clinical interview includes twenty questions covered under the following topic headings: Relationships, Present Values and Commitments, Religion, and Crises and Peak Exercises. Many questions have more than one part to it. The entire interview takes from one and one-half to two hours.

Interviewing was scheduled, conducted and taped by the researcher and typically took place in the private home of the subject. One subject requested the researcher's office, another the researcher's home. Every effort was made to respond to the convenience of the subject. The tapes were transcribed verbatim by

professional transcribers. A consent form reviewing the purpose, the process of the interview, and the procedure for protecting confidentiality was read and signed by each subject at the beginning of the conversation.

Scoring the interviews involved, first, reading through to obtain a general idea of the stage range of the interview and then a careful analysis of the responses by the transcribed protocol. Each question has been designated as yielding data on specific aspects. For example, the first question invites a description of parents, both mother and father, during childhood and in the present. Included in the question is a request for the observation of changes in the perception of the parents. This question is scored for social perspective-taking and locus of authority.

When all the responses have been scored on the aspects they are assigned, a global score can be calculated by determining the numerical average of all the individual response scores. If at least fifty percent of the responses fall in the average stage, the interview is said to be equilibrated at that stage. The modal or most frequently occuring score is also calculated as a way of checking the stage average. When average score and modal score agree, a faith stage can be assigned for the whole interview. If there is

not agreement between the two scores, the interviewee is suspected of being in stage transition. A separate average is calculated for each aspect to confirm this. The Manual (Fowler, 1986b) provides complete scoring criteria for aspects and stages.

The scoring of these interviews was undertaken by Karen DeNicola, coordinator of the Center for Research in Faith and Moral Development. This arrangement was made possible by a policy at the Center. Their standards for interviewing, transcribing, interrater reliability were thus assured.

Design and Statistical Analysis

The design of this study is descriptive. It seeks to describe the development of faith in relation to psychosocial development, specifically faith development in terms of intimacy development. This is accomplished by using James Fowler's Faith Development measure and an Erikson-based intimacy versus isolation measure (MPD) in order to compare subjects' scores on one measure with the other measure for difference. The comparison is done with a simple two cell design, using a t-test for measuring difference between high and low intimacy scorers on Fowler's Faith Development measure. A one-tailed test for differences between the sample means was used.

Since the subject size is necessarily limited by the scope of the project, the value of the study does not rely on statistical difference, rather the aim is to discern trends. This approach is not intended to dishonor the richness of the interview material either, but rather to be used for heuristic value in future faith development discussion. The current conversation about post-Piagetian development, the domain in which faith development operates, is an open field inviting participation. This study seeks to contribute to that theoretical discussion with a view towards a practical application in a liberal Jewish synagogue setting.

CHAPTER 4

Results

The design of this study called for the participation of a random sample of women who are members of a Reform synagogue. The full sample was sent a questionnaire that measured psychosocial accomplishment, Measures of Personality Development (MPD). One particular scale of this measure, the intimacy versus isolation scale, was then used to define two smaller subject groups for the second phase of the study concerning faith development. The two subject groups represented the high and low scorers on the intimacy versus isolation scale of the MPD.

Table 1 exhibits the raw data from the psychosocial measure of intimacy for the random sample of 67 women. The wide distribution of score results for the resolution of the psychosocial challenge of intimacy versus isolation provides a high scoring group and a low scoring group that have distinctly different psychosocial profiles. The characteristics of high and low scorers are described by the professional Manual (Hawley, 1980) that accompanies the test materials. The high scorers have successfully resolved the intimacy versus isolation stage conflict. Successful

resolution is marked by the ability to enter intimate relationships, and unsuccessful resolution, by the lack of that ability, or isolation.

Intimacy here is defined as

the capacity to commit to concrete affiliations and partnerships and to develop the ethical strength to abide by such commitments, even though they may call for significant sacrifices and compromises. (Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., 1980, p. 10)

The Manual (PAR, 1980) describes the high scorers as persons who demonstrate

their capacity to establish such relationships with both opposite-sex and same-sex individuals. They have the ability to share with, and care for, another person without losing their identity in the process. These individuals seek and are comfortable in emotionally close relationships in which they share thoughts and feelings. They confide in friends and are easily available to others. (Psychological Assessment Resources, p. 10)

In contrast, isolation is defined as

a tendency to remain alone and be self-absorbed because of a fear of ego loss. Isolation occurs if a person's identity is too weak to sustain the uncertainties of intimacy. (Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., p. 10)

The description of the low intimacy scorers is a profile of developmental stress that is caused by an inadequate resolution of the intimacy versus isolation conflict.

The identity of...(these) scorers is seriously threatened by the demands of intimacy; the commitments and responsibilities seem unreasonable or too restrictive of personal freedom. As a result, these individuals are emotionally distant in relationships, either being completely

self-absorbed or indiscriminately sociable.
Relationships are formal or stereotyped and lack
emotional mutuality. These individuals are not
able, or refuse, to share anything close to self
with anybody. They are frequently both drawn
toward intimate relationships and also frightened
by them when they become intense enough to demand
a strong commitment. (Psychological Assessment
Resources, Inc., 1980)

The two sample groups for the second phase of the
research consist of the very high intimacy scorers and
very low intimacy scorers. The differences in sample
groups assures that this study compares two distinct
psychosocial groups.

Table 2 presents additional data from the MPD
psychosocial measure. While the subject group was
chosen and grouped according to intimacy scores, the
identity resolution scores, generativity resolution
scores and total resolution scores were added to the
profile of the subject groups. The identity and
generativity scores represent the psychosocial issues
that rise to ascendancy immediately preceding and
following the intimacy issues in the sequence of life
stages according to Erikson's theory. The total
resolution scores represent a general or overall score
of psychosocial functioning. This total score does
not reflect specific conflict issues. It therefore can
represent a moderate lack of resolution for many stages
or a significant lack of resolution for only one or two
stages.

Table 2 is potentially relevant to the evaluation of the MPD as a useful instrument for the purpose of this study. The discussion in Chapter 5 will suggest that generativity is one possible way this psychosocial tool may reveal indications of principled thinking. These scales are also relevant to the discussion of gender-specific development.

The second phase of the study involved interviewing each of the subjects in the high and low psychosocial scoring groups using the Manual for Faith Development Research (Fowler, 1986b). These ten interviews were then scored by Karen DeNicola, research assistant to Fowler and expert rater, at the Center for Research in Faith and Moral Development at Emory University. In order to comply with the requirement for two raters which is an auditing feature that provides a measure of interrater reliability, this researcher trained and scored these interviews independently. Both raters were blinded to the scores of the other rater.

Faith development interviews were scored using the Manual (1986b). This standardized scoring method yields two global indexes of faith development: a faith stage score and faith maturity score. The stage score is an ordinal assessment that is calculated on an 11-level ordinal scale (Stage 1, 1/2, 2, 2/3...6). The

faith maturity score is a continuous assessment that can range from 100 to 600. This uses the final average of all the aspects without the decimal point. For example, the global score of 3.09 has an ordinal assessment of Stage 3 and a maturity score of 309. This provides the data for calculating interrater reliability.

Using Fowler's <u>Manual</u> instructions for computing a non-parametric measure of reliability, this study exceeds the requirements for scoring reliability between the two raters. Comparing the level of agreement between the stage scores, in 90% of the cases an interview received the exact same stage score or within one-half of a stage score from both raters; in 60% of the cases the scoring was within one-quarter of a stage.

The reliability coefficient was .89 for ordinal faith stage scores and .85 for continuous faith maturity scores. These correlation coefficients were calculated using Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient respectively.

The statistical analysis for psychosocial and structural correspondence are based on the Center's scoring. The decision was made by the researcher to use Karen DeNicola's computations because her scoring

represents more experience. Also the intent was to avoid any bias possible in methodological concern about scoring the interviews from one's own research sample. It is clearly impossible to have blind scoring conditions under these circumstances. For all these reasons, all $\underline{t}$ test calculations are based on the Atlanta scoring.

Table 3 charts the experimental group of high and low intimacy scorers who were interviewed with Fowler's Faith Development protocol and the results of structural faith stage scoring. This is the list of the results of Faith Development structural scoring and the difference between the two psychosocial groups of intimacy scorers. The group of high intimacy scorers averaged one-half stage higher in structural faith stage scorers than the group of low intimacy scorers, but this was not sufficient to establish a statistical trend ($\underline{t}$= 1.35, p > .05).

Lack of statistical significance, however, may not rule out the structural value of psychosocial accomplishment or even the possibility of statistical significance with a different sample. Visual inspection of the data suggests that psychosocial development probably does relate to structural development. The structural faith development scores of the low intimacy sample range from Stage 2.63 to

Stage 3.23. The faith stage scores for the high intimacy sample are 2.96, 3.02 and 3.07, with the two higher scores: 3.75 and 4.66. These two higher scores represent a significant structural faith stage advance. The evaluation of these results will be a primary focus of the forthcoming discussion.

Table 4 displays all aspect scores for each individual interviewed on the Faith Development instrument. This provides a break down of structural scores into sub-scores for form of logic, perspective-taking, form of moral reasoning, bounds of social awareness, locus of authority, form of world coherence, and symbolic logic, as well as group averages for each of these aspects. This offers a wealth of data. The scope of the hypothesis does not require the interpretation of these scores. For example, these aspect scores support Fowler's contention that aspect scores vary by no more than one stage. This relates to the discussion of construct validity that is a concern of some researchers such as Furishima (1985).

Further, these aspect scores may be valuable for generating new hypotheses. For example, the low scoring psychosocial group shows uniform Stage 3 sub-scores in locus of authority and moral reasoning. This may suggest that these two aspects represent the

core of Stage 3 functioning. Also, the lowest aspect scores occur in the area of symbolic logic which is reminiscent of Michael Shire's results amongst teenagers in religious school (1983).

Tables 5 and 6 present comparison data on psychosocial development and structural development using the psychosocial scales for identity and generativity. The arrangement of these comparison groups was accomplished according to MPD percentiles: persons scoring higher than 90% were in the higher psychosocial group, persons scoring lower than 10% were in the low group, and the median scores were eliminated. These rearranged groups of high and low psychosocial scorers in identity and generativity were then analyzed for correspondence with their faith stage structural scores.

Statistical analysis was done by t-test, and the correspondence was not significant between structural development and either identity or generativity scores. This is a weak comparison owing to the selection process of the comparison groups; the high and low identity and generativity scores are not drawn from the wider random sample but rather the sample groups already selected by intimacy criteria. Nevertheless, the identity and generativity data is offered in order

to interact with Carol Gilligan's work on women's development (1982) which suggests that the development of intimacy occurs in women before identity.

The t-test is a statistic that is used for the purpose of determining whether a difference between two sample means, when the sample is smaller than thirty subjects, is different due to chance or different because it is measuring two different populations. The hypothesis of this study predicted that the high psychosocial functioning subject group would score higher in structural faith development. This group does score higher, on an average by one-half stage score. However, the result from the t test indicates that the difference in these scores occurs by chance. No conclusion can be drawn as to significant difference in structural development between high and low psychosocial scorers.

The forthcoming discussion will examine this result. Further, the results show that the only high structural scorers among the subjects were from the high psychosocial scoring group. This will also be a focus in the discussion.

Table 1

Intimacy Resolution Scores of Random Sample

Raw Score	%	Plot
	99	
26		+..
	98	
25	97	+.
	96	
	95	
24	94	+..
	93	
23	92	++..
	90	
22	89	.
	86	
	84	
20	82	...
	79	
19	76	....
18	73	....
17	69	.....
	65	
16	62	..
15	58	....
	54	
14	50	.
13	46	..
12	42	..
	37	
11	35	...
10	31	...
9	27	...
	24	
	21	
7	18	.
6	16	*..
	14	*
4	11	.
	10	
3	8	..
2	7	*
	6	
0	5	*.
-2	4	.
	3	
	2	
-5		*
-6	1	.

Sample Population
* interviewed low scorers
+ interviewed high scorers

Table 2

Key Psychosocial Resolution Scores for Low and High Intimacy Groups

ID #	Age	Identity vs. Identity Confusion	Intimacy vs. Isolation	Generativity vs. Stagnation	Total Resolution
Low Intimacy Scorers					
1	39	-15	5	2	-28
2	39	9	2	16	88
3	35	2	-5	8	28
4	58	-9	0	0	-36
5	37	14	6	7	74
MEAN		+1	1.6	6.6	25.2
High Intimacy Scorers					
6	40	1	24	25	128
7	41	26	25	4	175
8	42	12	23	19	111
9	38	21	23	20	169
10	42	28	26	13	173
MEAN		19.6	24.2	18.2	151.2

Table 3

Faith Development Scores for High and Low MPD
Intimacy Scoring Groups

Low Intimacy Scorers	High Intimacy Scorers
2.63	2.96
2.99	3.02
3.13	3.07
3.18	3.75
3.23	4.66
3.03 MEAN	3.49* MEAN

* ($\underline{t}$ = 1.35, p> .05)

Table 4

Aspect Averages in Faith Development Scores for High and Low
Psychosocial Groups

ID#	Logic	Perspec Taking	Moral Judge	Bounds Soc Awar	Locus Author	World Coher	Symbol Logic
Low Intimacy Scorers							
1	3.25	3.5	3	3.5	3	3	3
2	3.4	3	3	3.25	3	3.25	3
3	3	2.67	3	2	3	3	2.33
4	3.25	3.5	3	3.5	3	3	3
5	3.25	3	3	3	3	3.25	3
MEAN	3.18	3.03	3	2.95	3	3.1	2.8
High Intimacy Scorers							
6	4.8	4.75	4.33	4.33	4.75	5	4.67
7	4	3.75	3.67	3.5	3.67	4	3.67
8	3.25	3	3.67	3	3.33	3	3.33
9	3	3.25	3	3.25	3	3	2.67
10	3	3	2.75	3	3	3	3
MEAN	3.61	3.55	3.48	3.41	3.55	3.6	3.46

Table 5

Faith Development Scores for Original Intimacy Sample

Grouped According to Highest and Lowest Identity Scores

Low Intimacy Scorers	High Intimacy Scorers
2.63	2.96
2.99	2.75
3.18	3.02
2.93 MEAN	3.24* MEAN

* ($\underline{t}$ = 1.03, p> .05)

Table 6

Faith Development Scores for Original Intimacy Sample

Grouped According to Highest and Lowest Generativity Scores

Low Intimacy Scorers	High Intimacy Scorers
3.18	4.66
2.63	3.07
2.99	3.02
3.23	
3.01 MEAN	3.58* MEAN

* ($\underline{t}$ = 1.21, p> .05)

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The comparison of the two theoretical frameworks for development has been accomplished by creating two distinct psychosocial sample groups and interviewing for structural faith development. The two groups, then, were evaluated for differences in structural scores. The hypothesis predicted that a successful resolution of the intimacy versus isolation psychosocial passage would correspond with higher stages of structural faith development. The value of determining whether psychosocial development corresponds with faith development lies in its implications for how best to approach the challenge of enriching the faith maturity of a congregation. Specifically, would an investment in supporting the resolution of normal psychosocial crises in the life cycle of congregants correlate with a substantial enrichment in faith and development of maturity?

Results from the one-tailed t tests do not confirm the predicted difference. There is a slight trend toward an increase in the structural faith development scores of the high intimacy group as compared to the

low intimacy group, but it is not statistically
significant.

A more detailed inspection of the data, however,
suggests some important nuances. The facts are as
follows: In the low intimacy group, there is no one
who scores above a faith Stage 3. In the high intimacy
group, three subjects in the very same range of high
Stage 2 and low Stage 3. However, two subjects score
at a higher faith stage level: one is 3.75, the other
is 4.66.

Since there are no high structural scorers in the
low psychosocial group and two high structural scorers
in the high psychosocial group, a more completely
defined relationship may be accessible by means of a
different study design. Fowler has asserted that
psychosocial accomplishment does not guarantee
structural stage development. The description of
"necessary but not sufficient" continues to be
suggested as a possible interpretation of the data
because the only high faith development scorers were
also high psychosocial scorers. If the hypothesis is
to continue to be a viable inquiry, it is important to
reflect on why this study did not measure a significant
correspondence.

In order to consider the meaning of these inconclusive results, we will look at the instruments that were used to measure development to see if they measured what the study intended to measure. We will also look at the design of the study itself, especially the selection of the sample to discover if the women in the study, due to their age or lifecycle circumstances, have any impact on the study results that were not factored into the original design. Further, we will investigate whether the use of the concept of intimacy is adequate to apply to both theories or whether there are distinctions that shape what accomplishment in intimacy means for each theory and at different stages and passages. Finally, we will look at the two theories and evaluate in the light of this study whether or not the empirical relationship between psychosocial progress in intimacy versus isolation and structural stage development warrants further research.

Instrumentation

The choice of Measures of Psychosocial Development (MPD) was based on its unique Eriksonian and psychosocial format which means that the feedback allegedly represents the conditions of resolution in each of the psychosocial stages. This was, in fact, the same tool used in Ken Stokes' Religious Education

Association and Gallup Organization sponsored study of

faith development in the adult lifecycle (1987). The

Ken Stokes' study reported

> comparing faith stages with how well one has
> resolved life issues, it is clear that those with
> more reflective faith (4-5 or 5) have less
> unresolved issues and no negatively resolved
> issues (Ken Stokes, Module II, 1987, p. 35).

Constance Leean's interpretation of the

psychosocial and structural stage interaction in this

Gallup study was particularly influential in the

selection of these tools because she asserted from that

research that the lack of resolution in intimacy is a

crucial factor that blocks Stage 5 development in this

culture (Leean, 1988). This present study looked to

confirm that finding and adopted the MPD as an adequate

measure to substantiate Leean's claim. The

correlational analysis of this study can be used to

prove or disprove a relationship, if not to draw

cause-and-effect conclusions regarding the relationship

between psychosocial and structural development.

The MPD's Definition

of Intimacy

In examining the actual questions that assess

intimacy in the psychosocial intimacy tool, the subject

is asked to rate a statement according to the degree to

which it represents a likeness of herself. The

statements assessing positive intimacy are

Warm and understanding
Share my most private thoughts and feelings with
    those close to me
Others share their most private thoughts and
    feelings with me
Comfortable in close relationships
Willing to give and take in my relationships
Others understand me
There when my friends need me. (Psychological
    Assessment Resources, 1980)

The statements on the same tool assessing negative

resolution of intimacy are

Prefer doing most things alone
Keep my feelings to myself
No one seems to understand me
Emotionally distant
Avoid commitment to others
Many acquaintances, no real friends
Wary of close relationships. (Psychological
    Assessment Resources, 1980)

These statements may well test for an intimacy

that is based in a psychosocial adjustment into

conventionally supportive relationships. It does not

appear that these statements inquire into any deeper,

more individuative characteristics of relationships.

If that is so, this psychosocial tool cannot

distinguish beyond what is available to structural

Stage 3's conventional-synthetic functioning, and

therefore this measure is not useful for interacting

with Stage 4's individuative functioning, nor can it

say more than the accomplishment that Stage 3

represents.

Further, the MPD is not able to screen out factors such as extroversion and introversion, and psychodynamic features that account for closeness such as dependency and the fear of being alone. The design of this study eliminated the extreme highest and lowest scorers in an attempt to eliminate pathology. However, this does not even begin to differentiate the high intimacy scorers in terms of the progress of their individuation in relationships.

Fowler's Definition of

Intimacy

In contrast, Fowler's faith development tool does provide acute distinctions for the development of intimacy in relationship. The criteria for social perspective-taking defines subtle standards for determining stage scores. These criteria take into account whether and to what degree the subject can understand the interior feelings of another, and the thoughts of another, and in fact, perceive the other as "other."

The structural scoring further includes an evaluation of the capacity to reflect on the opinions and concerns of another without defensiveness, projection and reduction. The core criteria of relationship also includes implicit determinants of relationship such as: whether or not approval

dominates as a motivation in relationships, that is, meeting the expectations of others; whether or not significant others are self-selected or determined by social milieu; whether or not conflicts are perceived as external to self or interior to self; whether or not the subject has developed an explicit theory or principles of relationship that consciously direct conduct.

Comparison of the Two Definitions

Here it becomes clear that Fowler's criteria for evaluating the development of relationship as an aspect of structural development penetrates deeper into development than the Eriksonian tool. This anticipates the forthcoming discussion about whether the operational concept of psychosocially successful intimacy is different at different structural stages. In terms of the tools used in this study for the measurement of intimacy, this discussion points to a strong possibility that these tools do not allow a study of interactions beyond the distinctions of structural Stage 3 development as measured by the MPD.

This conclusion may also be supported by the Erikson timetable for the occurrence of the issue of intimacy versus isolation resolution. Erikson places this psychosocial challenge after identity in the

chronology of the early 20s. This is substantially earlier than the kind of midlife structural criteria that Stage 5 requires.

On the other hand, Erikson does refer to the continued development of intimacy after childbearing when the differences between men and women emerge as a consequence of procreation and childrearing. These inherent antagonisms become explicitly real and must be perpetually subdued by a "mutuality of devotion" (Erikson, 1964, p. 129). This could refer to conventional belonging and female submission to the requirements of nurturing.

However, Erikson's brief comments on midlife relationship appear immediately following his discussion of the importance of identity formation occurring prior to intimacy in the timetable of young adulthood. Further, Erikson uses the word "ethics" in his description of the generativity that is accomplished in the resolution of the relationship conflict between sexual mutuality and role bipolarity. While this only obliquely refers to fairness in relationship, it does provide a case for a mature intimacy in the psychosocial framework of later adulthood. Erikson's theoretical remarks offer no more than these hints about what underlies psychosocial competence in intimacy. Nevertheless his remarks

appear to implicitly refer to more than what the measurement tool provides (Erikson, 1964). This invites further research and clarification of Erikson's psychosocial theory.

Possible Sample Bias

Next, we will consider the study itself, particularly the selection criteria for the sample. The sample was pooled randomly from the adult female membership of a temple roster. The decision was made not to mix genders in order to avoid a confusion in the meaning of the results that might occur due to the alleged variations in the sequencing of identity and intimacy in men and women's psychosocial development.

There was no consideration given to the particular lifecycle stage of the individuals: whether or not they were married; whether or not they were actively engaged in childrearing; whether or not they held a job or vocational commitment or perspective about creative work in the present or future beyond the family. The ages of the subjects, listed in the order of their identification number were: 39, 39, 35, 58, 37, 40, 41, 42, 38, and 42. This was perceived as sufficient to explore psychosocial and structural development at midlife.

In actuality, these subjects only appear to represent the psychosocial circumstances of midlife. One woman is single with no children; three women have children, including pre-school children; five more have children in elementary and junior high school; three women have two or three children where at least one of them is close to high school graduation or in the first year of college. Only one woman is past childrearing where the children are married or not living at home. In actuality, this sample represents a predominance of women still very active in childrearing.

The only women who at the time of the interview were engaged in a full commitment to non-family or non-household oriented work were the two high scorers in structural development. Other work situations among the subjects included part-time jobs that were reported as insufficient for financial goals and for personal satisfaction. volunteer work in the secular and affiliated communities was also represented among the subjects.

Theoretical Perspectives on Affiliated Women

Eight of the ten women in the combined sample of high and low intimacy scorers perceived their identity in terms of their relationships. This is indicated by their Stage 3 scores. A structural score of Stage 3 refers to persons who are dependent on loyalties that

hold their reasoning and perspective-taking to a synthesis of conventional ideas in early formal operations. Only two women have accomplished a perspective that differentiates them from their relationships. Their interviews demonstrate a reflectiveness about their significant others in a way that defines their identity as not derived from relationships.

This is not clearly reflected in the Eriksonian MPD scores, however. One high structural scorer has a high score in identity, intimacy and generativity, and the other high structural scorer has a low identity score along with high scores in intimacy and generativity on the MPD.

While the MPD does not confirm a clear perspective about autonomy or differentiation by its scores on the psychosocial identity scale for both structural high scorers, the structural scoring presents global scores and aspect scores for these two women that does suggest differentiation in relationship. This implies that the accomplishment of autonomy for women is crucial to further advance in faith development. Gilligan (1982) found that if a woman manages to develop beyond the relational context to include a perspective that is loyal to self as well as others, her development towards higher stages is more assured.

This suggests that intimacy in a differentiated relationship is a qualitatively more intimate experience of relationship than intimacy in a relationship of undifferentiated persons. The commitment to self and the passage beyond conventional thinking constitute a different relational self. Shirley Mader reaches this same conclusion about the interaction of women's psychosocial lifecycle and structural development. She interprets structural criteria to indicate that Stage 4 autonomy is only reachable by women at midlife when formal parenting is completed. Midlife, in this view, is defined as a struggle to establish the boundaries that make Stage 4 possible (Mader, 1986, p. 371).

In order to obtain clearer feedback about psychosocial accomplishment and higher structural development, a sample of women who have all completed childrearing and who are actively engaged in a committed, generative endeavor would offer a more defined comparison of psychosocial and structural measurement. With such an additional sample one would be more likely to find a broader range of scores on both instruments, which would allow a better test of the research question. In the current study, it seems the childrearing factor may have created an overwhelming determination of the outcome of structural

scoring. This limited the sample's ability to represent the study's ability to test the question at hand. This is the inevitable effect of the sample bia_: there can be no statistically significant difference if there is no range in scores.

Childrearing Women's Unique Pattern

Robert Kegan adds to this a perspective about women who graduate from college and then make the adaptation into married life. There is an apparent willingness by these women to accept responsibility and tolerate the discrepancy of a self in a family role that is diminished from the college-age Stage 4 self. This serves the myth of the culture while it nurtures family. What Kegan is ultimately describing is also explained by Fowler: how some women quietly assimilate a significant awareness of Stage 5 ambiguity while they are managing their families in a regressed Stage 3. When they are finally freed from childrearing and related constraints, they move briefly into Stage 4 and then almost immediately into Stage 5 (Mader, 1986, p. 372).

Kegan's and Fowler's comments on childrearing women focus the possibility that the structural faith development tool does not register all structurally meaningful psychosocial accomplishment. This may point to valuable, unmeasured relationship development that

contributes to structural maturity and explains why post-childrearing women who develop beyond Stage 3 advance so quickly to Stage 5, pausing only briefly at Stage 4 after a long period of Stage 3 functioning. Relationship development may be more related to structural development than the psychosocial and structural theories have indicated.

This is precisely the force of the research of Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule, (1986) where every advance in relationship impacts self-other perception. Relationship becomes an epistemological theater where persons learn dialectical reasoning from a truly empathic relationship where mutual listening and speaking of both thoughts and feelings occur. Belenky's work describes patterns of knowing that are increasingly sophisticated and satisfying for women; their new learning is based on the learning gained from the dynamics of communication within their families of origin. The higher range of female development comes from a woman's disciplining her subjectivity and developing skills for knowing another person. This becomes the procedure for knowing anything, and continued development provides a sense of partnership with knowledge in which the woman is fully aware of how knowledge is co-constructed by the knower. Belenky and

her colleagues, here, are saying something very similar to Gilligan by pointing to how much women learn about all of life through relationship.

The interview data in this study records that six of the women refer to a premarital or earlier time when they were a more distinguished self. Three women refer explicitly to the self that they have sacrificed for the family. Two women are just beginning to make a transition into a renewed working life and self-expression. This supports Kegan's notion of the Stage 3 framework of family life, even for college educated women who have already experienced progress to Stage 4.

Hidden Development

The exploration of the hidden development that may be occurring for women that is not registered by structural scoring invites speculation about what is concealed in the aspect scores that global stage scoring does not reveal. Review of Table 4 invites conjecture about the dramatic consistency of low psychosocial scorers' sub-scores for locus of authority and moral reasoning. Could these two aspects be crucial processes in nurturing a family, and at the same time, be restraints on childrearing women in their development of autonomy?

In support of the concept that the psychosocial accomplishment of autonomy is correlated with post-Stage 3 structural development, is Mader's longitudinal study of three post-childrearing women. Mader studied women aged 50, 56, and 58, each of whom over the course of a two year process of transition, accomplished the full structural stage shift to Stage 5. Mader focuses interpretation on the subjects' successful resolution of the midlife paradox of self: "a self that has continuity and everlasting connections and a self that is new and free." This requires a reflection process that moves women out of their embeddedness in relationship to the consolidated self of Stage 4 as a foundation for Stage 5. Stage 5 then incorporates both autonomy and connectedness for Mader (Mader, 1986).

Mader's work is interesting because it reveals her struggle with structural theory. She is uncomfortable with the apparent cognitive bias towards knowing in both Fowler and Kegan,

> My work with women, reinforced by Gilligan's findings, leads me to believe that the post-generative crisis is a response to that which precedes knowing: that in negotiating the transitions from one adult stage to another, the ego's capacity to know depends on its changing capacity to relate. Somewhere between the abstractness of the motion and the knowing one is required to give some attention to the reshaping, not only of the self, but of the objects, and to what it is the relationship provides. (Mader, 1986, p. 263)

Mader's reflection on her research comes very close to one suggested conclusion of this study about the possible unacknowledged contribution of relationships to structural development. The problem of what may be missing in the scoring criteria of the structural tool goes beyond the scope of this project. Even posing the issue as a problem with scoring criteria may be mis-naming it. This difficulty may be related to a problem that Fowler has already named through his appreciation of the concreteness of Belenky's work and his intention to incorporate Belenky's concrete criteria into his scoring manual (Karen DeNicola, 1990).

Indeed, Fowler's work is abstract. Scoring for stage criteria means reading interviews for structure and virtually ignoring content. Words themselves are not taken as a direct cue for scoring. The criteria for the differences in stages are not translated into concrete terms but are themselves conceptual.

The responsibility for apprehending the differences relies on the scorer's ability to hold the distinctions as separate levels whether his or her personal development has managed that transition or not. Scoring itself is a remarkable experience due to the challenge and the possibility for increased

explicitness in the scorer's cognitive repertoire. This system also presents the potential for scoring skews due to the scorer's lack of structural development. Fowler has not denied the abstractedness of his project. That he is open to being influenced by the work of Belenky and her colleagues suggests the possibility of increasing the subtlety in which relationship skills are scored.

On the other hand, the results of Mader's research do distinguish a structural stage accomplishment. The subjects in her study all accomplish the transition to Stage 5. Apparently something is being scored that represents a real achievement in spite of Mader's objections. What she points to, however, may highlight the important differences implied by structural and psychosocial development and their respective concepts of intimacy.

<u>Fowler's Qualitative Orientation</u>

We recall that Fowler has developed elaborate criteria for the scoring of relational skills. Added to this is Kegan's comment that college women during childrearing regress to Stage 3 while they are acquiring aspects of Stage 5 perceptual skills. Even with all of Fowler's efforts to appreciate

interpersonal skills, is Fowler's scoring of relationship imbalanced in favor of cognitive functioning, as Mader suggests (Mader, 1986, p. 262)?

A partial answer to the confusion about Fowler's abstractness comes from Belenky's work. The Belenky project makes explicit the epistemological shift that is offered by each succeeding stage accomplishment in communication style. This asserts that how an individual interacts and processes communication is how the individual interacts and knows anything. The emphasis here on thinking provides an opportunity to appreciate the meaning of Fowler's emphasis on cognitive characteristics, even in relationship.

In spite of Mader's objections, what was different about the women she studied after their developmental crisis was their ability to think about process, relationship and life in a new way. This productive reflection process is clearly emphasized in Mader's study. The contribution that continued advancement in formal operations makes to perception in all contexts of life for Fowler's structural theory is profound. Mader's research confirms this.

Yet Mader seems to be suggesting that Fowler may be neglecting some of the ordinary learning that individuals can accomplish in relationship by giving favor to abstractions. Another way of asking Mader's

question is to wonder if Fowler's tool is capable of making fine distinctions that allow us to understand the difference between high psychosocial resolution scorers who are measured at Stage 3 in structural terms and the high psychosocial resolution scorers who measure at Stages 4 and 5.

The study can explore the issue of what is missing from Fowler's scoring criteria for interpersonal development but cannot provide answers for this problem. We can continue to speculate, however, that there are many relationship skills that Fowler's tool does not measure. These skills may represent improvements in social life and social skills, like social graces, conversational style, and so forth, that increase closeness and improve an individual's adjustment in social relations. The reflective skills that Fowler also includes are developed in relation to cognitive advancement of post-formal operations; these skills that are representative of structural Stages 4 and 5, are also suggestive of a new level of competence that can provide a new reality in relationship.

Following this line of speculating, the cognitive features that Fowler is measuring are equivalent to what Belenky terms "procedural knowing," "connected knowing," and "constructive knowing." These terms represent shifts in an individual's experience that

allow for the realization of an autonomous perspective in which the person can distinguish and integrate reasoned reflection and feeling. This is the accomplishment that provides the individuation. Both theorists, "the abstract" Fowler and "the more concrete" Belenky, agree that the cognitive accomplishment is what is essential to the advancement of relationship. Applying this to relationship, in Stage 3 individuals <u>are</u> their relationships, and while they are very active in relationships, they are not reflective enough to understand the workings of these relationships. Beginning in Stage 4, individuals <u>have</u> relationships. This Stage 4 step accomplishes what Fowler calls "disembeddedness from relationship," and it signifies a great evolutionary step in learning (Snarey, 1983, p. 314).

<u>The Problems in Comparing the Two Theories</u>

This discussion focuses on how the advance in cognitive development may correspond with the qualities of relationships. This is where Fowler defines the difference between relationship at Stage 4 and beyond. One way to interpret the results of this study where the Erikson tool did not appear to distinguish high intimacy Stage 3 from high intimacy Stage 4 and 5, is to consider that the tool cannot make that distinction because it is not adequate to measure more than simple

conventional adaptation. Another possible interpretation for these results is that the MPD tool measures the growth we are looking for in some other way, for example by a combination of scales. A third suggested interpretation is that the psychosocial theory of development on which the tool is based is not sufficient to be useful in the measurement of intimacy at the level of post-formal operational development. A final interpretation would suggest that structural scoring is not subtle enough to measure the gains in development for women who are embedded in Stage 3 during childrearing.

On the other hand, the results of this study may have no meaning for the relationship of structural and psychosocial theories. This must be remembered in the midst of all of this speculating. One factor not yet mentioned is the possibility that traditional organizational membership, such as synagogue-affiliation, according to structural theory, typically attracts Stage 3 people. This could mean that the sample is already skewed by having too few higher structural stage people to permit an empirical comparison.

Having voiced this caveat, the speculation can continue about the MPD tool and psychosocial theory. Does the development represented by structural Stages 4

and 5 show up on the MPD in some other way, for example in generativity and ego integrity scores or total resolution scores? No suggestive patterning of the MPD scale scores among the subjects of this study presents itself to this researcher. Further, this study was not designed to compare high and low generativity scores from the original sample. We are thus limited in exploring other scales. In addition, psychosocial theory itself may offer more than what is evident by the tool.

Certainly, Erikson's epigenetic principle suggests that the eight psychosocial themes are continually processed throughout life. Whatever crises of intimacy is described in psychosocial theory, the ascendancy of the issue only begins in the young adult decade of the twenties. The later lifecycle stage of generativity may include a principled-thinking that goes beyond conventional roles. Erikson is also interested in exceptional individuals, for example, Luther and Gandhi, as well as ordinary persons. These examples represent the possibility that Erikson's work incorporates the subtleties of qualitative development. On the other hand, some people who participate in social action and other agendas that appear principle-based are in actuality operating from a Stage 3 motivation, that is, a belonging perspective. This

can be distinguished by structural stage theory. It remains to be seen if psychosocial theory can explicitly track development of intimacy and generativity at this post-conventional level.

The foregoing is not meant as a decisive analysis but rather a focused interpretation of the problems in comparing these two theories. It is difficult to estimate whether Erikson's developmental framework includes development beyond the initial stage of formal operations. This would be an interesting area for further research in order to draw clearer comparisons between the two theories. Further, the inclusion of Belenky's criteria for structural scoring may reveal from the structural perspective whether a more substantial bridge exists between psychosocial functioning and faith development.

Promising Trajectories

This study was designed as a project to encourage Jewish leadership in psychosocial support efforts that influence the development of maturity in faith. The Erikson framework was utilized in order to provide a psychosocial measure that represents successful resolution of ordinary life crisis, circumstances that clergy typically are involved with in their interaction with congregants. The research hypothesis was that accomplishment in this realm of personal development

would correspond with an accomplishment in faith development as well. The results are inconclusive, but for reasons already discussed, the hypothesis may still be viable. However, at this time, no guarantee can be offered that conventional psychosocial support systems that assist individuals in resolving the predictable crises in the adult lifecycle correspond with development in structural faith stages.

This study can address other concerns that are related to the practical use of structural development theory. The following comments are intended as reflections which may lead to further exploration. This thesis does not promise to develop all of these themes, but rather to suggest that there is value in pursuing these topics. The pastoral and educational role for rabbis who define their leadership in terms of developing and supporting the maturity of a congregation is central to the concern of this study and will be considered at greater depth at the end of this chapter.

The following themes of interest are offered: First, the Faith Development tool presents a thorough examination of relationship skill. The scoring criteria may be unnecessarily difficult to apply. However, the scoring criteria for "perspective-taking" appears to this researcher to give at least an

approximate score for individuation, which could be compared to the scoring for social closeness and social distance in the MPD. The structural scoring of relationship offers an analysis of relationship maturity at a profound level and indicates that personal development in relationship is correlated with the development of faith. This comes close enough to the original hypothesis to warrant continued exploration.

These observations also relate to the critique presented by Conn (1981a) where he suggests that affectivity is not registered sufficiently in Fowler's tool. Much of the foregoing discussion has been focused on how comprehensive the structural relationship criteria are and why the reflective categories are so important in relationships as well. The multifaceted scoring evaluation of the interview satisfies this researcher as sufficient commitment to both the affective and cognitive aspects of the individual. That additional scoring criteria may be added from the results of Belenky's study on women does not offset the balance of cognitive-affective criteria. Conn's critique urges the scoring of affectivity directly. This researcher appreciates the cognitive contexting of relational and affective development.

Secondly, just as Mader (1986) reported a meaningful stage difference in her sample of three midlife, Protestant women who completed a Stage 5 transition, this study reports two high structural scoring interviews that represent two Jewish women who have accomplished something very different in faith development from the other eight interviewees in this study. This suggests that Fowler's tool is religion-neutral, or at least, applicable to the Jewish community. The present study can be added to the kibbutz study (Snarey, 1990) and the study of Jewish teenagers in religious school (Shire, 1983) as resources for the Jewish community about faith development.

Thirdly, this research highlights the alleged differences in the developmental sequence of women as compared to men. If Gillman's article (1989) about what is going on developmentally amongst seminary students is reliable, some graduate students and professors are making transitions into Stage 5 functioning. As this is not a report of non-academic men who have young families, it is not a fair comparison to juxtapose academic students who utilize a scholastic method that cultivates Stage 4 procedural knowing with ordinary family people who are active in the commercial world, much less mothers in their

childrearing years.   These midlife subjects, due probably to their current engagement in childrearing, represent the female dilemma with the conventional perspective of Stage 3.

Further, Gillman's personal and professional goals defined in structural Stage 5 terms (1989) parallel the quest of men and women, later in the lifecycle, who continue their engagement with the process of development.   This also describes Mader's sample of women who are each at least 50 years old.   Gillman's focus on Stage 4 stagnation in rabbinical students and Mader's focus on Stage 3 stagnation in the family relational matrix among women are both long range perspectives for Stage 5 development which represent advances for their respective communities beyond the conventional horizon.   Both Gillman and Mader are interested in facilitating the higher structural levels of faith stage development among specific populations.

The difference between the men at seminary and the midlife sample of women in this study may parallel the results of Gilligan's work with structural moral development (1982). This present study suggests that women during their childrearing years are likely to remain at Stage 3 in faith development. The two high structural scoring women at Stage 4 and Stage 5, who are the only women in the study working outside their

homes full time, and Mader's three Stage 5 women, all active in vocations, suggest that by the decade of the 50s when women are working and past childrearing, they may be more capable of Stage 4 and Stage 5 development.

Fourth, the problem of the interview and scoring format as raised by Nelson and Aleshire (1986), C. Schneider (1986), and Harris (1986) is indeed perceived by this researcher as a challenge for Fowler. The abstract criteria makes scoring a specialized skill requiring experience in scoring. There is sparse availability of trained scorers. Also, a considerable amount of pre-interview training is necessary in order to recognize the need for consistent probing for scorable answers. Further, the success of the Belenky project (1986) suggests that a scoring procedure utilizing more natural conversational language is equally viable. That Fowler is already contemplating the inclusion of this natural style indicates that this problem may be resolved (Fowler, 1990).

A reflection on the interview format in its present shape is relevant here. This researcher is satisfied that these subjects were interviewed sufficiently and scored accurately. The interview experience was perceived almost unanimously by the subjects as a rare opportunity to think out loud and put their life and thinking together in meaningful

statements. Three of the subjects appeared to gain an unexpected intervention for personal psychological work and for realizing new life themes that need attention. Interviews tended to be intense, and some of the subjects shared visible emotionality in some of the subjects. In all cases, the researcher was personally moved by the interview process.

Further, the cognitive requirements of the interview where "why" is asked of feelings, perceptions and beliefs was very meaningful and has resulted in this researcher's reappraisal of cognitive development as fundamental to the facilitation of personal meaning and the maturing of a congregation. The evaluation of the results of this study has caused a reassessment by the researcher of the perspective presented in the introduction of this thesis about Martin Buber.

From the perspective of the completed study, Martin Buber's development appears as much of a product of his multifaceted intellectual pursuits as it is a product of the depth of his personal relationships (Horwitz, 1988). In the introduction of this thesis, there is a discussion about Martin Buber that implies that his leadership in development was due to the intense and creative processing of his personal pain surrounding his mother's abandonment of him, and the support and enrichment he developed in his

relationships with his grandparents and wife. The same introductory chapter records Buber's active and creative intellectual life. In light of the results of this study and review of Buber's intensity for both intellectual and interpersonal realms, a subtle appreciation for how cognitive development lends itself to self-reflection in relationship revises the original perspective of Buber's development. This provides an appreciation of Buber as the product of all of his interests and efforts. This causes a reappraisal of what models of support and education are likely to influence structural faith development.

This study has served to adjust this researcher's perspective about faith development in the Jewish community by utilizing Fowler's cognitive, perceptual and relational criteria in conversation and in group discussion much like the recommendations of Yedwab (1986) and Shire (1983) in the preceding review of literature. Their applications were intended mainly for the contexts of worship and education. This will be discussed further in the forthcoming section concerning feedback for the congregation.

The process of the interview, itself, was unanimously experienced by the subjects as facilitating something valuable for them. Something along these lines may be productive for use with congregants in

terms of pastoral conversation because it represents an exploration and personalizing of religion. This interview process may itself be an intervention that stimulates Stage 4 reflection.

Attention to the structural developmental possibilities in counseling have been explored in Mary Carlsen's work (1988). Further, Kegan (1982) suggests that transition points in development are periods of disequilibrium and may be related to psychopathology. He goes as far as labeling five different kinds of depression that can occur that are specifically related to each stage transition.

This linking of mental health to stage transition offers a pastoral opportunity for spiritual maturity that may distinguish itself from the role of psychotherapy (Kegan, 1982, pp. 268-272). This means that rabbis can interact with suffering congregants in a way that presents an invitation for the deepening of faith and self as an enrichment or adjunct to therapy rather than providing counseling itself. This discussion offers to clarify the rabbi's already overburdened role.

Further, a structural framework has been applied to groups in order to create higher stage process in organizations. The application of this development involves a reflectiveness about the group dimension of

congregational life and how the quality of group process can serve to enhance both the functioning of the group as well as the development of its members. Some of the elements of this paradigm include: shared reflection about the purpose of the organization; an open interpersonal process with a social accountability that implies advanced features of perspective-taking; a perspective that appreciates the particular historical moment in the life of the group; problem-solving and conflict resolution which seeks to stretch beyond conventional solutions; paradoxes such as freedom versus control, expert versus participatory decision-making are encountered and not reduced or simplified (Kegan, 1982, p. 245).

There is evidence that this kind of process is intentionally occurring in some parts of the Jewish community. Notable is work done by Schacter and recent articles which have appeared in Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Responsibility. The forum of moral dilemma discussions adapted from Kohlberg and utilized in many Jewish educational and congregational settings fits into this paradigm of structural growth (Schwartz, 1983).

Conclusions from the Study

Structural theory can provide criteria that is instrumental in creating and evaluating natural support systems such as family, friends and community. Structural stage growth requires specific "holding environments" for advancing in stage development (Kegan, 1982, p. 256). This kind of evolution is possible to facilitate to some degree in a congregation by intention. The present study which compared the results of psychosocial and structural growth highlights the contribution that a structural framework offers. This does not eliminate the value of ordinary psychosocial development and support. What has been demonstrated in this research is the insufficiency of the psychosocial model to predict structural faith stage development owing to any one or a combination of the following factors:

1. The limits of the design of this study in the selection of subjects.

2. The limits of the MPD to reflect psychometrically the full range of psychosocial development of intimacy.

3. The limits of psychosocial theory to

distinguish between conventional relationship adjustment and post-formal operational development that characterizes relationship at a whole new level of functioning as well as a distinctive shift in structural faith stage.

4. The limits of structural scoring in measuring the subtle gains in women's development during their childrearing years when they are embedded in the relationship context of Stage 3.

Further research is necessary to compare these two theories for conclusive difference.

Feedback for the Congregation

The results of this study suggest that the faith development of most women in this congregation is likely to measure Stage 3. This confirms Yedwab's speculative assessment that the Reform Jewish community measures Stage 3 or 4 (Yedwab, 1986). Further research is needed to determine the development of the men in the congregation. What this study reports means that at least one member of each affiliated family is probably Stage 3. This is not surprising since Stage 3 is the stage of belonging and the synthesis of conventional ideas and values.

How is this information useful? In the introductory chapter, reference was made to seminary education and the method of learning Torah that "breaks

the myth" of the tradition for rabbinical students (Gillman, 1989). This explains how rabbis develop beyond Stage 3 and then return to the congregations they serve and conduct their rabbinate by matching the congregations' level. This implies that rabbis may have developed the awareness and comprehension of both Stage 3 and Stage 4 as paradigms of knowing. This suggests that Fowler's faith development theory can be applied to the rabbis' experience and used to describe these stages in order to translate them into two heuristic vocabularies and two frames of reference.

The potential for mirroring the development of different people is embedded in the theoretical description for Stage 3 and Stage 4, and this provides rabbis with an instrument for enhancing their ability to recognize Stage 3 and Stage 4 and ultimately to teach, preach and facilitate for these different stages. This can allow rabbis to speak effectively to different audiences and serve the needs of different groups.

Beyond the congregation, the large numbers of unaffiliated Jews can be addressed more effectively with the use of stage theory as a diagnostic. Familiarity with the stage distinctions can provide an assessment of the needs of an individual, family or group through focused discussions or extended

conversations. Inviting a focus on another person or group's perspective can draw out some of the determinants of their stages.

Among unaffiliated Jews who represent Stage 4 development, a belonging ethic of harmonized differences will not be satisfying or appreciated. Here, individuated expression is highly prized. In the past twenty years, the opportunity to individuate in a community that values intimacy as well as differences has been most available through the Havurah movement. This is where some Jewish writers locate the movement of liberal spiritual renewal in Judaism (Petsonk, 1991). Typically, these groups meet in homes and other locations outside of the synagogue.

From the perspective that individuals develop across the lifespan and some journeys realize stage transformation, Havurah groups can be invited to form within the congregation and do their seeking and personalizing of religion with the support of the larger community. This has been very successful where it has occurred outside and within the synagogue. Further, personalizing Jewish themes for discussion can be encouraged and promoted among the general congregation and the unaffiliated community by

appropriate publicity. This sponsors Stage 4 concerns and supports both Stage 4 congregants and stimulates individuals who are making transitions from Stage 3.

The small group is an exceptional environment for facilitating many valuable developmental skills. This is true in explicitly educational settings as well as worship settings. These experiences can be organized for the purpose of sharing perspectives, personalizing prayer and inviting and accepting contradictory points of view. This stimulates tolerance, empathy, and potentially "third person perspective," which is Stage 4 and 5 development in reflectiveness.

The small group discussion can be applied to any topic. When it is used in connection with moral dilemmas, a protocol for discussion has been developed that includes every participant in a supportive atmosphere where cognitive dissonance is promoted by the leader's permission to explore an issue and interact from many points of view. Research indicates that this format is highly effective in stimulating higher stages of moral reasoning among Jewish students (Friedman, 1987). Teachers utilizing this process of moral dilemma discussion have compiled Talmudic references in order to present a Jewish perspective at the higher stage of principled thinking. This is presented as only one possible perspective. The

process itself negates the Stage 3 convention of accepting authority without reflection. This offers the opportunity for Jews to appreciate Jewish ethics from principled reflection rather than the shoulds and have-tos of religious belonging.

In the area of symbolic function, Torah study can be a context for the study of tradition that begins with conventional interpretation and moves to historical interpretations, and then to the personal. These multiple meanings can expand the congregants' relationship to text. This kind of study can also stretch the Torah reading beyond conventional interpretation. If the Torah has one probable meaning in the context of its origins, other meanings over the generations of rabbinic Jews in Europe and other phases of premodernity, and then current interaction with the text is invited to generate present meaning, this is the kind of conversation that cultivates a personalized, multiple perspective Judaism at Stage 4.

In discussing the opportunities for addressing and facilitating the aspects of moral reasoning, perspective-taking and symbolic logic, the environments and processes described also influence locus of authority and form of logic. Sharing and acknowledging personal points of view is itself a shift towards internalizing authority. Form of logic and world

coherence are stimulated by issues of moral reasoning and engaging the challenge of conflicting points of view.

Further, this discussion recognizes that development, according to Fowler, is not a matter of simple hierarchical progression. Fowler's stage theory is intentionally conveyed as a structural whole that involves at least seven complex lateral features that must be developed to a sufficient degree in order to shift the stage paradigm. Enrichment certainly provides growth and continued integration of the current stage. There is a tremendous potential for collateral integration. There is also the opportunity for stage transformation. This is the context of post-Piagetian development.

A good example of the time schedule and the intentionality required for stage transformation is revealed in the testimony of one Los Angeles alternative prayer group called, the Library Minyan. Over a period of seven years, this group developed by a process of consensus a sophisticated format that includes a fully participatory service where women and older children are empowered along with the men to lead in the reading and discussion of Torah and the policy decisions that arise naturally out of reading Torah for relevance to current contexts of concern. Worship is

communal, intimate, and has even generated some of its own music. The interdependency and growth in knowledge has sustained this group's inspiration and development over a period of twenty years where it now numbers about 350 people. The core of the Minyan is its participatory and intimate environment that is so essential for spiritual seekers (Rembaum, 1991). After twenty years, this experimental group has comfortably rejoined the rabbi in the sanctuary while retaining its participatory and decision-making power. This suggests Stage 5 accomplishment.

The value of the small group for learning and prayer and the living experiences of consolation and joy in community are echoed by Harold Schulweis (1990). Schulweis' description of the alienated Stage 4 Jew brilliantly captures the dilemma of the synagogue which is faced with deinstitutionalizing the religion in order to satisfy the individualized needs of this "new breed of Jew." Schulweis calls for a Jewish perestroika by which he means, "the decentralization and personalization of Jewish belief and practice" (p. 125). This is where these psychological Jews can find a Jewish education that applies their interior life and their family domain without embarrassment about their ignorance.

Schulweis has been a leader in personalizing Judaism during his entire career. His comments about small groups appeared in a recent publication in response to another concern that is occurring in the Jewish community. The lead article defined a problem that has been voiced in other places including the passionate work, Where are We? by Leonard Fein (1989). In this instance, the issue was explored by Eugene Borowitz and speaks to the shifting ethos among American Jews that can no longer be satisfied by the State of Israel as the only center of spiritual value. First, Israel is not currently living up to the highest ethical ideals of Judaism according to many American Jews. Along with that disillusionment is the lack of definition of what Judaism stands for in America and what Jews can believe in order to inspire a vital community.

Applying Fowler's stage diagnostic, Schulweis' response that Jews need personal experience, not ideology, can be interpreted as a realistic appraisal of what Schulweis perceives is going on in the community and how these Stage 4 Jews can be reclaimed for the experience of an enriched and integrated Jewish life. Philosophical leadership of the kind that Eugene Borowitz is writing represents a concern for an explicitness in the system's boundaries and

definitions. This is also a Stage 4 concern according to Fowler's criteria; it is a Stage 4 feature of "form of logic," and "form of world coherence." By "explicit" system, Fowler is pointing to something very different from the Stage 3 implicit values of traditionalism that would certainly suffocate a Stage 4 population. Further, an explicitness in philosophy that is open to complexity and ambiguity is a Stage 5 accomplishment in self-definition.

Perhaps Borowitz' agenda is premature. When self-definition does occur for this community, if it represents the development that is possible for this generation, it will come from a maturing quest that is going on in the interior life of American Jews. From a developmental perspective, both the small group experience of personalized religion and explicitness in self-definition are necessary for accomplishing Stage 4. Schulweis appears to have an intuition about this when he writes that this self-definition is "a premature concern" for those who have not yet accomplished the personal quest.

These post-Piagetian categories of development, even with the changes they are likely to undergo with the passage of time and research, can provide a perspective for holding many points of view simultaneously. Developmental theory also contributes

an awareness of differing methods for different stages. This kind of inclusiveness of worldview is itself a Stage 5 perspective. As such, it provides a valuable hermeneutical tool for rabbis who face many developmental variations amongst their congregants, and many texts and rituals to interpret in the ongoing vocation of serving Jews in this generation. The conflict of interpretations and revealed paradox have long been the hallmark of the rabbinic tradition. The process required by these recommendations calls forth the perceptual flexibility and advanced development by the rabbinic and lay leadership of this generation.

In the realm of pastoral care and counseling, the rabbis' role in naming the developmental theme that marks the individual's personal quest as a spiritual step could offer a welcome adjunct to conventional and secular therapies. Even limited contact with an individual's psychological concern can invite a reflective conversation that offers suggestions about the relevance of Judaism to personal issues. The understanding of what is possible in faith development from crises and personal suffering can be learned from Fowler's stage descriptions and also clinical reflections on this sort of post-Piagetian theoretical work. Recommended resources for acquiring this

understanding could start with Fowler's work and include the more clinically oriented Robert Kegan (1982) and Allen Ivey (1986) and Mary Carlsen (1988).

Sensitivity to the personal meaning of emotional pain can also be appreciated by a rabbi who has been encouraged to pursue his or her own personal quest. This kind of integrated personal development is unmatched in its ability to resource other individuated journeys. Such conversations for the spiritual framing of issues can mark the beginning of journeys or can take the shape of a consultation that reflects on the progress of therapy. These kinds of interactions can also occur serendipitously because they flow from a rabbi's seasoned awareness of what is possible in life, an awareness that waits only for teachable moments whenever and wherever they occur.

The realization of cognitive development's relevance to psychotherapy and the possibility that psychotherapy can offer substantial development is new for therapists who are trained psychodynamically. Typically, cognitive development has had more influence in the field of education. This does not mean that therapies that are not incorporating this structural framework are not effective. An exploration of what facilitates development in counseling is outside the scope of this work.

However, it is clear that symptoms that ambiguously reflect the dynamics of a developing spiritual maturity as well as mental illness can be addressed effectively by the trained rabbi who is ready with acceptance, encouragement and understanding. This presence does not suggest that the rabbi needs to duplicate the work of the mental health professional. The role of naming the journey, focusing the issues of trust in self, the value of truth in relationships and empowering a responsible growth with confidence and love, along with a referral to a competent professional, is the pastoral role suggested by this researcher. Studies indicate that congregants want private therapists for confidentiality. Rabbis are already overburdened with responsibilities. The consultant role with a faith developmental perspective could be enormously enriching.

The results of this study do not indicate that the work of psychosocial resolution of lifecycle issues alone yields structural faith development. This does not warrant, therefore, the participation of rabbis to the extent of a counseling contract. The work of structural faith development is comprehensive and life-long. It involves transformations in thinking, perception and relationship. It also requires commitment and interest. Surely, the work of the rabbi

encounters many opportunities to engage in this activity in the education, worship and social domains of congregational life.

Looking Towards Paradigm Change

In comparing what appears to be the psychosocial concern for functionality in development through the life cycle and the structural concern for cognitive-affective quality in development, this researcher has distinguished a role for rabbis that aligns them with the qualitative quest. A qualitative quest includes the individuated development of autonomy and intimacy and advanced cognitive functioning in formal operations. This cognitive and psychosocial development parallels structural faith stage growth from Stage 3 to Stage 4 and beyond. This leaves secular therapies with the task of helping people mature through specific blockages that arrest the natural course of developmental learning. Successful therapy ideally restores individuals and families to increased functionality where the evolutionary flow of life's learning occurs as a natural journey.

The role for rabbis that this researcher is suggesting is in inspiring, teaching and sharing an intentional quest. This refers specifically to the goal of generating a Stage 4 and Stage 5 perspective

which by definition is a self-reflective and responsible relationship to living. This by itself will not sound new for Judaism.

What is new is how this goal leads through Stage 3 traditionalism and Stage 4 autonomy and distancing from tradition to an authentic reintegration of "religious" perspectives and lifestyles at Stage 5. If the development of Stage 4 requires, among other tasks, a consideration of a wide variety of viewpoints and an explicit theory about relationships disembedded from mere sentimentality and belonging, Stage 4 would mean that persons would be reflecting deeply on who they are, what kind of adults they choose to be, what kind of adult children they want to produce, and the ultimate reality that empowers these values. This envisioning would incorporate tradition as well as personal experience.

The rabbinic tradition's perspective on relationships can be perceived within a legal structure of rule-based relationship, as well as a sophisticated philosophy about relationships in covenant and guidelines for translating this ideal form of relationship in terms of suggested or required ethos (Kaplan, Schwartz & Kaplan, 1984). This researcher suggests that the traditional observant Jewish lifestyle is a Stage 2 or Stage 3 appropriation of

tradition when it is lived from the perspective of mythos or rules. One of the educational tasks for the developing Jewish community, then, is to demythologize the interpretation of the texts concerning relationships for their meaning in terms of the current requirements for productive, empowering and nurturing relationships for each individual in family and community.

This entails a self-conscious project of reflecting on text, on self, on God, on family relationships, and on relationships in general for a fresh vision and reading of Torah. This is potentially both radical and reconstituting. This discussion, so far, points to the possibility of a Stage 4 reflection on self and relationships in order to satisfy the personal needs of individuals developing from Stage 3, and Stage 4 persons who are striving to understand their relationships in order to create families who are intentionally supportive of everyone's well-being. Prior to Stage 4, a clear understanding of authentic individual needs is not available to persons, nor are collaborations for partnership and interdependence realistically possible until Stage 4 deepens and moves toward Stage 5 transition.

Reflection about one's self and relationships assists Stage 3 persons in developing cognitively and disembedding themselves from their relationships. This offers to support the Stage 3 childrearing mother typified by this study in sorting through the demands of her role and in increasing Stage 4 tools for reflection and explicitness. These tools provide her with skills to renegotiate her role with her spouse in their developing relationship and in their role together as parents to provide the Stage 3 belonging and rule-based living that is so essential for children's welfare. They can do this from the increased parental competence of a Stage 4 perspective. This education enhances actual cognitive and interpersonal development, which translates into autonomous thinking and expanded skills in empathy and negotiating.

Less idealistic, this kind of education can mirror the tasks of this period in women's lives and the developmental stagnation that childrearing may involve. Such an education offers compassion and increases self-understanding. The same thoughtfulness needs to be applied to men and their individual, spousal and parental roles. A reflection on the dynamics of family life for the purpose of supporting each individual and all relationships is a new context for the

re-interpretation of tradition at the micro-level of family and the macro-level of community. This can be accomplished directly by self-examination and group discussion and enhanced by literary explorations of biblical characters and the family dynamics portrayed in Bible stories. Interaction with Scripture can begin with text analysis and move to the more imaginative realms of character and relational analysis.

A perspective of family life that perceives all of the relational dynamics as a complex structural whole is itself a Stage 5 accomplishment in development. This systemic perspective is supportive of individuating family members and the differentiating of individual roles in family life, as well as a context for profound intimacy between marriage partners, close relationships between parents and children, and continued development through high level collaboration among family members. This is the ideal level of development from which lay and rabbinical leaders in the community can model the personalized meaning-making process through personal sharing, interpretation of Scriptures and interdependent collaboration in congregational discussions and projects.

Within the Jewish community, one example of a systemic interpretation of the family from the perspective of Torah is offered by Kaplan, Schwartz,

& Kaplan (1984) who analyze the meaning of covenant in terms of the relational context of intergenerational family life. Their interpretation reframes a myriad of orthodox religious relationship rules into an understanding of how such laws offer the possibility of sound object relations in the family. This translates rules into a concrete operational application of a principled perspective about ideal relationship, specifically the relationship of two spouses in covenant working together as sexual partners and parents to create a nurturing and protected environment for children. This collaboration of partners develops children into mature individuals capable of their own adult individual, marriage and family life.

Underneath this apparent simplicity is the qualitative understanding of how the dynamics of this family structure avoids the problems of symbiosis, triangling, sexual abuse, narcissism, indeed all of the tyrannies of the lack of individuation. The development of healthy family relationships is not a coincidental concern of Torah, the Kaplans assert (p. 9). The individuated self in responsible relationship is one requirement for a mature relationship with God.

From this perspective, the Kaplans interpret the rules surrounding menstruation, circumcision, sexual relations, the honor and care for elders, education of

children, differentiation of roles, and so forth. This is one example of the demythologizing and reconstituting of tradition that is possible for the education and development of Stage 3 and Stage 4 congregants.

The current liberal Jewish community has rejected the Stage 2 authoritarian appropriation of their heritage. They have substituted a Stage 3 social belonging that has invited secularization of religion and distance from the religious lifestyle. The reflection process in Stage 3 can be advanced by education to a Stage 4 exploration of self and relationship. This researcher asserts that such an agenda also advances the appreciation of Torah. This is the hermeneutic principle that Paul Ricoeur refers to when he describes the potential of a text to provide both archaeology and teleology (1967). Torah incorporates a complete developmental range; the text can be interpreted from the perspective of all the stages.

Another exegesis of Torah from a systemic perspective is represented in the work of Barbara Krasner (1978, 1980, 1986a). Her interpretation of covenant as trust-based relationship and her use of psychotherapy to restore trust in families speaks directly to the agenda of developing persons beyond

Stage 3 in both Fowler's and Belenky's terms. The discussion in Belenky's work is especially rich in suggesting the psychodynamic issues of Stage 3, and this analysis matches Krasner's agenda.

Belenky and her colleagues call Stage 3 "subjective knowing" and they describe this way of knowing in terms of "failed male authority" (Belenky, 1986, p. 56) where women retreat into their subjectivity and hide behind conventional roles. The unresolved disappointment and insecurity in women's lives accounts for their distrust and inability to create relationships of mutuality. Instead, women in this stage communicate indirectly and produce collusive family alliances that add more obstacles to the task of individuation. The sorting out of interpersonal injuries and the intergenerational conversations for forgiveness and healing educate individuals towards a reflectiveness about their own subjectivity and add the dimension of interpersonal reality and interpersonal skill of Stage 4 individuation.

Krasner's work also introduces a Stage 5 dimension of God-talk similar to Martin Buber's theology of mutuality. Explicit discussion about God is not comfortable for Stage 4 persons when it is presented in the conventional theological framework of Stage 3 language of God as "father" and "lawgiver." In Stage

4, the rational agenda takes priority with reflection about ordinary life and the logic of personally chosen values, and the experience of self with others in the balance of relationship.

Stage 5 comes after this period of autonomy and rational clarity. It develops with the realization of the inevitability of suffering, loss and limitation. This is usually a midlife realization, though all stages can benefit from the maturity of Stage 5 theologizing even if it is only a model for future possibility. Stage 5 involves a re-entry into the rituals and myths of tradition with the awareness that myth is myth, and that it offers profound enrichment through a symbolic and existential realm of meaning about self and life. The Stage 5 individual can incorporate the nuances and tensions of one God with many revelations, one Scripture with many interpretations. This theological dialectic is similar to the interpersonal dialectic growing out of the

psychosocial and cognitive accomplishments of advanced adult development.

A revitalized language about God is therefore an important agenda for supporting and enhancing the development of congregants. This is a project that needs to be initiated in the seminary during rabbinical

education and in continuing education; it also needs to be facilitated by rabbis in the congregation in a spirit of mutual discovery and transforming quest. This Stage 5 theologizing is surfacing in the liberal Jewish community and is evidenced by the publication activity of rabbis such as Kushner (1989) and Gillman (1990a).

This discussion of faith stages provides a cognitive map for assisting persons in their specific developmental circumstances. While adult development is a complex discussion about psychosocial advancement and cognitive accomplishment, it is also a phenomenon that is occurring in the liberal Jewish community as a matter of course. This concluding discussion has sought to define ways to facilitate the journey for those in the congregation who choose to model the journey, and for those persons who step forward and help to facilitate the process for others. It is ultimately both an individual and community quest undertaken in the context of a sacred respect for persons and their individual process and a simultaneous trust that Torah gives life to all generations.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Letters to Temple Members

Barbara R. Grossman, M.A., M.F.C.C.

Muirlands Medical Center

<div align="right">

24432 Muirlands Blvd.
Suite 201
El Toro, California 92630
(714) 770-2362

</div>

December 4, 1989

Dear Temple Member,

Thank you for responding to my questionnaire. In the next two weeks the response sheets will be scored and I will have the information that some of you requested as well as the foundation for the second stage of the study. At that time, I will be in contact with ten women from this first stage and I will be requesting an interview. The interview will follow a format developed by a distinguished professor and researcher Dr. James Fowler of Harvard University and Emory University.

In the event that you do not hear from me requesting an interview, and you have not requested scoring information from me, this will be my last formal contact with you as a study participant. I want you to know how grateful I am that you have participated and enabled me to create a data base for this study. I would not be able to progress in this dissertation which is the final step of an academic degree that is a long-standing goal of mine.

I thank each of you dearly for your cooperation. I invite your inquiries about the progress of this study by phone, in writing, or casually whenever an occasion brings us together. Again, my heartfelt thanks for your taking the time to complete the questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

Barbara Grossman

Barbara R. Grossman, M.A., M.F.C.C.

Muirlands Medical Center . *24432 Muirlands Blvd.*
Suite 201
El Toro, California 92630
(714) 770-2362

January 5, 1990

Dear Study Participant,

I am writing to invite you to participate in the second and final stage of my research project. Your scores on the M.P.D. defines you within the range of what I am looking for to pursue my study. This stage involves an interview that is conducted by me personally and follows a format that has been formalized by Dr. James Fowler of Harvard and Emory Universities.

I will be calling you in the next weeks to schedule your interview at your convenience. I will allot two hours and will recommend that we meet at my home. I can also offer my office in El Toro as a location, but <u>I want you to understand the research and not clinical purpose for this interview.</u> I therefore provide my home in Laguna Niguel as a setting if it is convenient for you.

I want you to know that this interview will be audiotaped and evaluated by an independent team from the Center for Moral and Faith Development in Atlanta, Georgia. This eliminates my involvement with evaluating interviews with people who are my friends and fellow synagogue members. I can also offer you complete confidentiality. No one in our community will have any access to individual results. You have been selected by your M.P.D. scores, not by your name, and you will be referred to in this way in all study writings.

I enthusiastically encourage you to continue with me in this study. It represents the only research done on an exclusively Jewish group of women who are synagogue-affiliated. The area of faith development is a research field that is on the cutting edge of life-cycle and moral development research. It is literally exploding with new studies, predominantly with Christian groups and cross-section Americans which

includes Jews. The first study on an exclusively Jewish population, American and Israeli, has just been published. My study focuses on congregation-affiliated Jews and looks at different practical correlations. It will be relevant to all Jewish leaders including rabbis and educators.

I am not able to more fully disclose my research design at this time. I hope you understand my restraint in discussing it at this stage. I have enclosed xerox copies of materials that I request you look at to orient you to the interview. The interview itself consists of twenty questions that invite personal reflection.

I will be happy to answer any questions you have about the faith development interview format. I will be calling you at your home phone number. You are also welcome to call me at home at 831-7944. I look forward to this next interview stage and to speaking with you personally and conducting this interview.

Thank you for your patient attention.

Sincerely,

Barbara R. Grossman

Barbara R. Grossman, M.A., M.F.C.C.

Muirlands Medical Center

24432 Muirlands Blvd.
Suite 201
El Toro, California 92630
(714) 770-2362

November 1, 1990

Dear Research Participant,

I want to thank you again for sharing your self and your time in the faith development interview. The tapes of the last series of interviews are now being transcribed. They will then be sent to Atlanta. The background material of the study is already written. The results will be analyzed and in print by January 2.

I send my deepest appreciation for your help in this project. I have been surprised continuously by how much more than just a research project this has felt to me during the course of the interviewing. I have been moved consistently by the texture of your lives and by your thoughtfulness about what matters to you most.

Best wishes to you and your family.

Sincerely,

Barbara Grossman

Barbara R. Grossman, M.A., M.F.C.C.

Muirlands Medical Center   :   *24432 Muirlands Blvd.*
Suite 201
El Toro, California 92630
(714) 770-2362

October 6, 1989

Dear Temple Member,

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a study for my dissertation concerned with women's faith development for the Reform Jewish community. The results of this study will help provide preliminary criteria for adult spiritual and social programs.

I am particularly interested in your response because of your affiliation with Temple Beth El and your age group. The questionnaire is the first stage of the study. A representative group of ten people will be asked to participate in the second stage of this research.

The average time required for completing this questionnaire is fifteen minutes. I appreciate you filling out and completing the answer sheet by November 27th and returning it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Other phases of the research cannot be carried out until analysis of the questionnaire data is completed.

I welcome any comments that you may have concerning this questionnaire, and I am pleased to send you a summary of the results if you like. I have discussed this project with Rabbi Krause and he fully supports our Temple's participation in this research. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Barbara R. Grossman

APPENDIX B

Informed Consent Form

This form was used at the beginning of each interview.

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Purpose of Study: An exploration of faith development among affiliated, Jewish, adult women

Researcher: Barbara R. Grossman, M.A., Ph.D. Candidate

Date:

    This is to certify that I, _____, hereby agree to participate as a volunteer in an exploratory study as an authorized part of the educational and research program of Barbara R. Grossman in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D. at The School of Theology at Claremont. I understand that this research will be under the direct supervision of Barbara R. Grossman.

    The research and my part in it has been defined and explained fully to me by Barbara R. Grossman and I understand her explanation. The procedures of this study and their risks are described in this form as well as their benefits.

    I have been given an opportunity to ask whatever questions I may have had and all such questions and inquiries have been answered to my satisfaction. Future inquiries will be answered promptly.

    I understand that I am free to deny any answer to any specific item or questions in the questionnaire or interview while I also understand that I am encouraged to complete all questions

    I understand that any data or answers to questions will remain confidential with regard to my identity.

_____   _____
     Date   Signature

Procedures to be followed:

1. Subjects will be asked to complete a questionnaire providing personal information. (M.P.D.) Confidentiality will be respected and protected by the researcher. Specific steps will be taken as evidence of that respect.

2. Individuals participating in the study will be asked to prepare a personal Life Tapestry which is a prescribed outline format as a prelude to an extensive interview concerning faith development. The interview will take approximately two hours.

3. The researcher will share her findings with the individuals who are subjects in the study by request. Again, confidentiality will be respected.

Benefits and risks to the subjects:

1. Benefits - an opportunity to reflect on one's life with a trained M.F.C.C. and the enjoyment and perspective to be derived from that, together with an opportunity to explore matters of faith that may potentially impact the design of programs in the Reform Jewish Community.

2. Risks - no known risks.

Procedures to be followed in the interest of respecting subject's privacy and confidentiality:

1. Communication concerning participation in this study will take place directly with the researcher rather than through a third party.

2. The names of the participants in this study will not be revealed to third parties.

3. Names will not be utilized in the researcher's dissertation. Fictitious names may be considered for use in addition to statistical and thematic trends.

4. Participants will have the right to be informed about the findings of the study.

5. The interview protocols will be coded for confidentiality and scored by technicians who are not involved in this study nor in this community.

I, the undersigned, have defined and fully explained the research to the subject.

| _____ | | _____ |
| Date | | Researcher |

| | | _____ |
| | | Initials of Subject |

APPENDIX C

Measures of Psychosocial Development (MPD)

Item Booklet

Profile Form for Female, Ages 25-49 and
Female, Ages 50+

Adapted and reproduced by special permission
of the Publisher, Psychological Assessment
Resources, Inc., 16204 North Florida Avenue,
Lutz, Florida 33549, from Measures of
Psychosocial Development by Gwen A. Hawley,
Ph.D., Copyright, 1980, 1984, 1988 by
Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
Further reproduction is prohibited without
permission from PAR, Inc.

MPD
Item Booklet

Instructions

Begin by completing the information on the top of the MPD Answer Sheet. Enter your name, sex, age, education, marital status, and the date.

This booklet is divided into seven sections containing statements or phrases which people often use to describe themselves, their lives, and their experiences. For each statement, fill in the circle on the answer sheet which best represents your opinion, making sure that your answer is in the correctly lettered circle. DO NOT ERASE! If you need to change an answer, make an X through the incorrect response and then fill in the correct circle.

Fill in Ⓐ if the statement is *not at all like* you.

Fill in Ⓑ if the statement is *not much like* you.

Fill in Ⓒ if the statement is *somewhat like* you.

Fill in Ⓓ if the statement is *like* you.

Fill in Ⓔ if the statement is *very much like* you.

For example, if you believe that a statement is very much like you, you would fill in the (E) circle for that statement on your answer sheet.

```
┌────────────────────────────────┐
│            Example             │
│                                │
│      Ⓐ   Ⓑ   Ⓒ   Ⓓ   ●       │
└────────────────────────────────┘
```

Fill in only one circle for each statement. Be sure to respond to all of the statements. Please note that the items are numbered in columns.

Additional copies available from

PAR Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
P.O. Box 998 / Odessa, Florida 33556 / Telephone (813) 968-3003
Reorder # 1396-TB

Section 1

1. Calm, relaxed, easy going
2. Stick to the tried and tested
3. Have worked out my basic beliefs about such matters as occupation, sex, family, politics, religion, etc.
4. Bored
5. Self-sufficient; stand on my own two feet
6. Easily distracted; can't concentrate
7. Warm and understanding
8. Life has passed me by
9. Good things never last
10. Seek out new projects and undertakings
11. Not sure of my basic convictions
12. Like taking care of people and things
13. Easily embarrassed
14. Eager to learn and develop my skills
15. Prefer doing most things alone
16. Believe in the basic dignity of all people

Section 2

17. Generally trust people
18. Can't seem to get going
19. Clear vision of what I want out of life
20. Younger generation is going to the dogs
21. Make my own decisions
22. Give up easily
23. Share my most private thoughts and feelings with those close to me
24. Full of regret
25. It's a cold, cruel world
26. Insist on setting goals and planning in advance
27. A bundle of contradictions
28. Involved in service to others
29. Can't be myself
30. Industrious, hardworking
31. Keep my feelings to myself
32. Believe in the overall wholeness of life

Section 3

33. Optimistic, hopeful
34. Tend to delay or avoid action
35. Stand up for what I believe, even in the face of adversity
36. Not getting anywhere or accomplishing anything
37. Do things my own way, though others may disagree
38. Feel inferior to others in most respects
39. Others share their most private thoughts and feelings with me
40. Wish I'd lived my life differently
41. Others let me down
42. Like to get things started
43. Wide gap between the person I am and the person I want to be
44. Absorbed in the creative aspects of life
45. Stubborn; obstinate
46. Competent, capable worker
47. No one seems to understand me
48. Life is what it should have been

Section 4

49. Good things are worth waiting for
50. Cruel, self-condemning conscience
51. Found my place in the world
52. Self-absorbed; self-indulgent
53. Independent; do what I want
54. Do only what is necessary
55. Comfortable in close relationships
56. A "has been"
57. Generally mistrust others
58. Like to experiment and try new things
59. Uncertain about what I'm going to do with my life
60. Deep interest in guiding the next generation
61. Very self-conscious
62. Proud of my skills and abilities
63. Emotionally distant
64. Life has meaning

Section 5

65. Generous
66. Inhibited; restrained
67. Others see me pretty much as I see myself
68. Uninvolved in life
69. Neither control, nor am controlled by others
70. Can't do anything well
71. Willing to give and take in my relationships
72. Life is a thousand little disgusts
73. Pessimistic; little hope
74. A real "go-getter"
75. Haven't found my place in life
76. Doing my part to build a better world
77. Uptight; can't let go
78. Stick to a job until it is done
79. Avoid commitment to others
80. Feel akin to all humankind—past, present, and future

Section 6

81. Trustworthy; others trust me
82. Passive; not aggressive
83. Appreciate my own uniqueness and individuality
84. Stagnating
85. Control my own life
86. Lack ambition
87. Others understand me
88. No hope for solutions to the world's problems
89. People take advantage of me
90. Adventuresome
91. A mystery—even to myself
92. Trying to contribute something worthwhile
93. Uncertain; doubting
94. Take pride in my work
95. Many acquaintances; no real friends
96. Would not change my life if I could live it over

Section 7

97. Trust my basic instincts
98. Overwhelmed with guilt
99. Content to be who I am
100. Vegetating, merely existing
101. Feel free to be myself
102. Without my work, I'm lost
103. There when my friends need me
104. Humankind is hopeless
105. On guard lest I get stung
106. Aggression helps me get ahead
107. In search of my identity
108. Finding new avenues of self-fulfillment
109. Easily swayed
110. Productive; accomplish much
111. Wary of close relationships
112. Satisfied with my life, work, and accomplishments

Female

Ages 25-49

Name_____ Age____ Education_____ Marital Status_____ Date_____

Column headers (diagonal): Percentile/T Score, Trust, Autonomy, Initiative, Industry, Identity, Intimacy, Generativity, Ego Integrity, Mistrust, Shame and Doubt, Guilt, Inferiority, Identity Confusion, Isolation, Stagnation, Despair, T Score/Percentile

P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	N1	N2	N3	N4	N5	N6	N7	N8	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	TP	TN	TR

Positive Scores	Negative Scores	Resolution Scores	Total Scores

Female

Ages 50+

Name_____ Age____ Education_____ Marital Status_____ Date_____

Column headers (rotated): Percentile/T-Score, Trust, Autonomy, Initiative, Industry, Identity, Intimacy, Generativity, Ego Integrity, Mistrust, Shame and Doubt, Guilt, Inferiority, Identity Confusion, Isolation, Stagnation, Despair, T-Score/Percentile

	Positive Scores								Negative Scores								Resolution Scores								Total Scores			
80									20																				80
										22							26	28			28			215	135			
								18	21		24				28			28					205		
										23	21					25									
75		28							17	21	20	16						27	28	214		75
	28	28	27	28			20	20	19	20	18	25	24				130	200	
99								19	20	19	17	27	24	28	27	26	28	125	192	99
			28	28	16	18	18	18	15	16	23	26	27	211	120	190	
98/70	26	28	18	17	17	19	26	23	210	115	189	70/98
97	27			15	17	16	17	15	27	25	25	209	112	187	97
96			27	16	16	15	14	22	26	27	207	109	183	96
95	27	25	14	14	18	14	25	22	206	105	179	95
94	26	28	27	27	15	15	16	13	21	26	24	24	26	204	103	174	94
93/65	27	13	13	17	12	13	21	20	23	25	200	97	173	65/93
92	25	24	26	14	15	16	11	12	24	19	25	23	25	198	88	172	92
90	26	26	26	12	14	12	14	11	20	22	24	195	86	169	90
89	26	24	13	15	10	10	19	18	24	22	21	24	193	83	165	89
86	23	27	25	25	11	13	13	11	14	9	23	18	17	21	23	191	79	160	86
84/60	23	25	25	12	13	17	23	20	23	189	76	157	60/84
82	25	22	10	12	12	10	11	8	22	16	20	22	186	75	153	82
79	26	24	24	9	12	8	16	22	19	22	184	72	148	79
76	22	21	24	11	11	9	10	7	21	15	15	21	19	18	182	68	144	76
73	24	23	8	11	7	14	21	21	180	65	140	73
69/55	25	23	23	10	10	8	9	6	20	14	20	18	17	178	63	138	55/69
65	21	20	23	7	10	6	13	19	16	20	20	176	59	135	65
62	23	24	22	22	9	8	5	19	13	12	18	17	15	19	19	173	55	130	62
58	20	19	22	6	9	7	9	5	12	11	16	170	53	128	58
54	23	21	7	18	17	15	14	18	18	169	51	126	54
50/50	18	21	21	8	8	8	4	17	11	10	16	13	17	167	49	119	50/50
46	22	19	20	21	5	6	6	4	16	14	12	17	165	46	116	46
42	17	22	20	20	7	3	10	9	15	13	11	16	16	163	44	112	42
38	21	18	4	7	7	5	3	15	9	8	12	15	160	42	104	38
35	16	21	19	19	19	20	5	6	14	7	14	11	10	14	15	158	40	101	35
31/45	17	3	6	6	8	13	10	9	14	156	37	95	45/31
27	20	20	18	18	19	4	2	2	13	7	6	9	13	13	154	36	91	27
24	16	15	18	4	5	12	5	12	8	8	12	12	152	33	88	24
21	19	17	17	18	2	5	5	6	11	7	7	10	11	150	32	85	21
18	19	14	17	3	4	11	4	10	5	9	10	148	30	79	18
16/40	15	18	16	16	17	4	3	1	10	5	3	6	8	144	28	71	40/16
14	13	16	15	4	1	9	4	2	9	4	3	9	140	27	64	14
11	18	14	17	16	1	2	3	8	1	8	2	6	8	138	24	56	11
10	12	15	15	14	15	3	2	7	3	-1	7	-3	1	4	7	134	22	53	10
8	17	11	16	14	13	3	6	2	-2	6	2	0	3	6	130	21	48	8
7/35	16	13	10	14	14	1	2	5	-4	4	0	-1	2	5	125	20	37	35/7
6	15	9	15	13	13	12	2	1	0	3	1	-5	3	-1	1	4	124	18	33	6
5	14	12	8	14	11	13	2	0	1	-6	2	-2	-2	-1	0	116	17	30	5
4	13	7	12	10	0	-1	0	-7	1	-3	-3	-4	-1	115	10	4
3	12	12	11	9	12	1	-2	-1	-8	0	-4	-5	105	14	-5	3
2/30	11	11	6	13	8	11	1	1	0	-4	-2	-9	-1	-5	-4	-6	100	20	30/2
	10	9	10	7	10	-5	-3	-10	-6	-5	-7	-2	95	12	-25	
1	10	5	8	11	9	9	0	-5	-7	-7	10	-30	1
	9	9	7	7	6	-6	-11	-8	-9	-6	-8	-3	90		
	4	6	6	0	0	-6	-12	-9	-10	-4	85	9	-35	

P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	N1	N2	N3	N4	N5	N6	N7	N8	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	TP	TN	TR

Positive Scores	Negative Scores	Resolution Scores	Total Scores

APPENDIX D

Life Tapestry Instructions

Life Tapestry

From <u>Manual for Faith Development Research</u>
(pp. 20-23) by R. Mosley, D. Jarvis and J.
Fowler, 1986, Center for Faith Development,
Atlanta. Unpublished Manuscript. Reprinted
by permission.

Using the Life Tapestry Exercises

Instructions for the Respondent

Take a moment to look over the work sheets that
you have in front of you. After you have looked at the
chart for a few minutes, turn back to this page for
some explanation of the categories at the top of the
work sheet.

1. CALENDAR YEARS FROM BIRTH. Starting at the
left column of the work sheet, number down the column
from the year of your birth to the present year. If
there is substantial number of years in your life, you
may wish to number the columns in two, three, or five
year intervals.

2. PLACE - GEOGRAPHIC AND SOCIOECONOMIC. Here
you may record your sense of place in several ways. It
could be the physical place you lived in at different
times in your life, including the geographic area where
you lived, or it could be your sense of your position
in society or community. Record your sense of place in
whatever way it seems most appropriate to you.

3. KEY RELATIONSHIPS. These can be any types of
relationships that you feel had a significant impact on
your life at home. The persons mentioned need not be
living presently, and you need not have known them

personally. (That is, they could be persons who influenced you through your reading or hearing about them, etc.)

4. USES AND DIRECTIONS OF THE SELF. Here you can record not only how you spent your time but also what you thought you were doing at the time.

5. MARKER EVENTS. Here you may record the events that you remember which marked turning points in your life-moves, marriages, divorces, etc. Major events occur and things are never the same again.

6. AGE BY YEAR. This column simply gives you another chronological point of reference. Fill it out with the same intervals you used for calendars on the left-hand side of the chart.

7. EVENTS OR CONDITIONS IN SOCIETY. In this column we ask you to record what you remember of what was going on in the world at various times in your life. Record this as an image or phrase, or a series of images and phrases, that best sums up the period for you.

8. IMAGES OF GOD. This is an invitation for you to record briefly, in a phrase or two, what your thoughts or images of God --positive and negative--were at different times of your life. If you had no image of God or cannot remember one, answer appropriately.

9. CENTERS OF VALUE. What were the persons, objects, institutions, or goals that formed a center for your life at this time? What attracted you, what repelled you, what did you commit your time and energy to, and what did you choose to avoid? Record only the one or two most important ones.

10. AUTHORITIES. This column asks to whom or what did you look for guidance, or to ratify your decisions and choices at various points in your life.

As you work on the chart, make brief notes to yourself indicating the insights or thoughts you have under each of the columns. It is not necessary to fill out the columns in great detail. You are doing the exercise for yourself, so use shorthand or brief notes. Later you can use the second work sheet to make a copy of your tapestry to bring to the interview.

After you have finished your work with the chart, spend some time thinking about your life as a whole. Try to feel its movement and its flow, its continuities and discontinuities. As you look at the tapestry of your life, let yourself imagine it as a drama or a play. Where would the divisions of it naturally fall? If you were to divide it into chapters or episodes, how would these be titled? When you have a sense of how your life might be divided, draw lines through these

areas on the chart and jot down the titles on the reverse side of the work sheet.

This is the unfolding tapestry of your life at this particular time. In the coming days or months you may want to return to it for further reflection, or to add to it things that may come to you later. Some people find that the Unfolding Tapestry exercise is a good beginning for keeping a regular journal or diary. You may find too, that if you come back to this exercise after some time has passed, the chapters and titles in your life will be different as you look at them in the light of new experiences. We hope you have enjoyed doing this exercise.

(c) Center for Faith Development

The Unfolding Tapestry of My Life

Calendar Years from Birth	Place Geographic & Socio-Economic	Key Relationships	Uses & Directions of Self	Marker Events	Age by Year	Events & Conditions in Society, World	Images of God	Centers of Value and Power	Authorities

APPENDIX E

Faith Development Interview

From <u>Manual for Faith Development Research</u>
(pp. 37-41) by R. Mosley, D. Jarvis and J.
Fowler, 19886, Center for Faith Development
Atlanta. Unpublished Manuscript. Reprinted
by permission.

Faith Development Interview

I. Life Tapestry and Life Review

Begin the interview by receiving the respondent's life tapestry and biographical data sheet. This is a good way to get the interview going, and gives you a chance to warm up your respondent as well. In your own review of the respondent's tapestry and biographical data prior to the interview, you probably have formulated some questions that you would like to clarify. This is the best time to ask those questions. Care should be taken, however, to keep this section of the interview as brief as possible. Respondents will sometimes want to expand upon the tapestry in great detail. (Aspects: A, B, D, E, G)

II. Relationships

1. Are there currently any relationships that seem important to you, either with persons or groups? Why do you think that these are important? (Aspects: B, D, E)

2.   Do you recall any changes in relationships that have had a significant impact on your life or your way of thinking about things? (Aspects: B, D, E)

3.   How do you think of or remember your parents at present?   What stands out to you now about your father or mother? Can you describe them for me? Have there been any changes in your perceptions of your parents over the years? When? (Aspects: B, D, E)

III.   Present Values and Commitments

1.   Do you feel that your life has meaning at present?   What makes life meaningful for you? (Aspects: F, A, B)

2.   Are there any beliefs, values or commitments that seem important to your life right now?   (Aspects: F, E, A)

3.   When you think of the future, how does it make you feel? Why? (Aspects: F, E, C)

4.   Do you think that actions can be right or wrong? If so, what makes an action right? Are there certain actions or types of actions that are always right under any circumstances? Are there certain moral opinions that everybody should agree on? (Aspects: C, E, D, B)

5. If you have a question which you cannot decide or a very difficult problem to solve, to whom or what would you look for guidance? (Aspects: E, C)

6. When you have an important decision to make, how do you generally go about making it? Can you give me an example? (Aspects: E, C, B, D, A)

7. How about moral decisions? Are they the same, or is there a difference? What makes a decision a "moral decision"? (Aspects: C, E, F)

IV. Religion

1. Do you think that human life has a purpose? If so, what do you think it is? Is there a plan for our lives, or are we affected by a power or powers beyond our control? (Aspects: F, A)

2. What does death mean to you? What happens to us when we die? (Aspects: F, G, A)

3. Do you consider yourself a religious person? What does this mean to you? (Aspects: F, G, A)

4. Are there any religious ideas, symbols or rituals that are important to you, or have been important to you? If so, what are these are why are they important? (Aspects: F, G, A)

5. Do you pray, meditate, or perform any other spiritual discipline? (Aspects: G, A)

6. Do you think there is such a thing as sin or evil? (Aspects: G, A, F, E)

7. If people disagree about a religious issue, how can such conflicts be resolved? (Aspects: E, B, F, D, C)

V. Crises and Peak Experiences

1. Have you ever had moments of intense joy or breakthrough experiences that have affirmed or changed your sense of life's meaning?

2. Have you experienced times of crisis or suffering in your life, or times when you felt profound disillusionment, or that life had no meaning? What happened to you at these times? How have these experiences affected you?

3. Do you feel that currently you are growing or changing in any areas of your life? If so, where do you feel most in need or most open to change? What is your "growing edge" at this point?

APPENDIX F

Scoring Criteria for Faith Development

Form of Logic
Perspective-Taking
Moral Judgment
Bounds of Social Awareness
Locus of Authority
Form of World Coherence
Symbolic Function

Used by permission from Center for Faith
and Moral Development, Emory University,
Atlanta.

ASPECT A: FORM OF LOGIC

Stage 1.
1. Thoughts are episodic or impressionistic; incapable of observation & argument.
2. Animism: pcptns blur animate/inanimate, invest objects w/ intentionality.
3. Lack space/time categories: blur reality/fantasy.
4. Blur reality & pcptns of reality. (Appearances are real & unquestioned.)
5. Associational: things & events appearing together will be accepted as related, though they have no logical relation.
6. Object/ego fusion produces "egocentric" incapacity for dialogue; language is incidental to conversation.

Stage 2.
1. Capable of concrete operations, generally; specifically, these include:
2. Can construct groups and classes and to compare like and unlike things.
3. Can see concrete cause-effect relations; can see events in those terms.
4. Comprehends reversibility & conservation (e.g., if 2 + 3 = 5 then 3 + 2 = 5).
5. Can think in terms of space & time & can order objects & events in a series.
6. Distinguishes reality from appearances (one's pcptn of reality).
7. Understands that things can change or appear differently at different times.
8. Language is central to interaction & communication; takes other as separate.
9. Concrete reasoning; can generalize from concrete particulars.

Stage 3.
1. Can experiment & deduce from observable results; cannot yet control and manipulate variables with precision; cannot isolate relevant variables when many are combined.
2. Does not understand the concept "all other factors being equal." Cannot yet construct systems and subject hypotheses to rigorous testing. Systematic thought would be stage 4.
3. Tacit thinking; can't explain the reasoning process used to answer questions.

4. Ideas are more nebulous and undifferentiated than Stage 4's.
5. Fantasy becomes more coherent and complex than Stg 1, displaying social/self ideals which facilitate the transition to adult roles.
6. Reflects on concrete experience, but can't do (Stg 4) 2nd-order reflection.
7. Able to construct abstractly the position of the other & esp. of the group; can construct collectivities, but cannot see these as constructions; no Stg 4 reflective awareness.
8. Can't distinguish between self & system; "self" is derived and not independent.
9. Incapable of rigorously systematic & critical thought; can be one-sided or stereotyping.

Stage 4.
1. Formal operational, explicit, reflective, and can perform operations on thinking. Key difference between Stg 3 & 4 on this aspect is tacit logic of 3 vs. explicit logic of 4.
2. Primary concern with system boundaries, definitions, and making distinctions. Often dichotomizing, it tends to set up rigid "either/or" classifications.
3. Reasoning is linear, deductive, one-dimensional; actively seeks closure through selected system. Lacks 4/5 or 5's openness, multi-dimensional approach to logic and thinking.
4. Collapses dichotomies in one direction to resolve tensions.
5. Stage 4 logic does not display an explicit process or historical orientation.
6. Rarely a concern for the unconscious; Stage 4 overvalues conscious processes.

Stage 5.
1. Explicit, analytic, & formal operational; aware of tensions and polarities.
2. Tensions & ambiguities embraced for their potential to yield deeper understandings.
3. Less concerned with system boundaries than Stg 4. Instead there will be a sense of the limits of finite systems and

a more "open-systems" approach to thinking about reality.

4. Thought is more inclusive & displays less dichotomizing than Stg 4.

5. Thought is multi-systemic or multi-dimensional. Problems or questions are examined from a number of different perspectives; or through a series of different modes of analysis.

6. Orients toward process rather than system thought; may overemphasize process at the expense of system and definition. Don't confuse with Stg 3 "easy pluralism."

7. Can hold dichotomies & paradox in tension rather than achieving closure by collapsing.

8. Has greater tolerance for ambiguity than Stg 4. OR, there may be the attempt to re-define rationality in terms broader than the technological or formal scientific.

9. Has knowledge of or openness to the depth dimension (UCs, etc.) in human beings.

Stage 6.

1. Synthetic reasoning; able to find unities beyond diversity and to resolve paradox by finding a deeper level of analysis; often novel and original.

2. Logic evidences an awareness of paradox and dichotomy and is able to resolve these tensions without ignoring or collapsing one pole of the dilemma.

ASPECT B: SOCIAL PERSPECTIVE TAKING

Stage 1.   1.   "Egocentric" conversations are monologues
which include/exclude other at will.
2.   "Perspective taking" limited to imitative
empathy & need for others' goodwill.
3.   Imitative empathy--via fusion with other.
4.   Responses to others concrete & situation-
specific; cannot generalize
5.   Self/other fusion causes separation &
abandonment to be significant anxieties.
6.   Pcptns of others limited to others'
effect on self (fear, suspicion, reward).
7.   Pcptns of others can be highly fantasy
charged.

Stage 2.   1.   Can hypothesize an unseen 2nd individual
who has different psptv.
2.   PT usu. concrete; no Cs awareness of
other's interiority (thoughts/feelings).
3.   Knows fantasy/reality; lacks Stg 1
fantasy-charged images of other's
interiority.
4.   Other usu. objectified in terms of
his/her reactions to self's needs &
wants. Moves beyond Stg 1's immediacy
to attempt prediction and control in
social relations.
5.   Can be negative in characterizing others
different from himself.
6.   Perspective-taking is not fully mutual;
lacks Stg 3 ability to see the self from
the imagined perspective of the other and
to have a reflective sense of self.

Stage 3.   1.   Mutual and interpersonal; can understand
the interiority of the other (esp.
feelings and emotions), but often can
only achieve this in a limited or
stereotypical way.
2.   Embedded in social relationships; the
"generalized other" determines the "me."
3.   Significant others are not usually self-
selected; social context determines
choices.
4.   Not usually critical or systematic except
in a stereotypical way; can be reflective
and abstract, but not in detail; often

accepts others' opinions w/out deliberation or comparison.

5. Able to take the other's motives and intentions into account.

6. Appearances are central & give confirmation of who "I" am vis-a-vis significant others.

7. Oriented toward meeting the expectations & gaining approval of "generalized other."

8. Interpersonal conflicts are external (self vs. others), not self's conflicting desires.

9. Lacks (Stg 4) intuitions of relational rules or a theory of relationships.

10. Takes other's perspective in an individual and concrete way, by "putting himself in the other person's shoes" mentally; other not seen in (Stg 4) terms of abstract relational system.

Stage 4. 1. Systematic approach to perspective taking. Others constructed via their ideas, histories & worldviews; or as part of larger, generalized systems of relationships; or perceived, construed and evaluated through the lenses of the person's self-selected worldview or thought system.

2. Can consider & analyze other viewpoints, but often defensively.

3. Constructs the other (and the self) in terms of general rules, laws or principles of relationship. Has a theory of how people should relate to each other.

4. PT will center on the forms of relationship and institutional values, rather than the values of interpersonal harmony and concordance of Stage 3.

5. Unable to construct the full interiority of the other. View of the other is often limited to a reconstruction of the other's ideas and thought processes. Stage 4 orients the individual toward ideas and worldviews; it is usually not able to accord the other autonomy from

the self, to see the other in his or her otherness.

6. PT that attempts to genuinely see the other as other and that appears not to use conceptual systems or worldviews to evaluate the other may be Stg 5.

Stage 5.
1. Able to take other's perspective with less concern for self-defense.
2. Can see what something might mean to the other without projection.
3. Can take & identify with different perspectives, without reducing or suppressing them.
4. Can grant autonomy to the other & see the other from the other's perspective.
5. Fully formal operational; conscious, conceptually mediated, and critically reflective.
6. Often self-critical, rather than defensive; brackets own viewpoint to see other's clearly.
7. Can acknowledge & affirm the other's interiority & see that it may differ from one's own.
8. Often an emphasis on the particular in social perspective taking. The other is valued for his/her uniqueness as an individual, and not only for his or her membership in a class or group.

Stage 6.
1. Perspective taking is concrete; able to understand and identify with others' perspectives.
2. Felt sense of solidarity with others, both with individuals and groups.
3. "Absoluteness of the particular"; identification with the perspective of the other because the perspective of that other is representative of a larger group or of the whole.
4. Do not confuse the sense of solidarity/ identification with the fusion which can occur at other stages; here, a sense of individual identity should be present.

ASPECT C: FORM OF MORAL JUDGMENT

Stage 1. 1. Consequentialist: esp. physical consequences, deprivation, punishment.
2. Episodic logic cannot support understanding of intentions or motives of an act when determining whether it is right or wrong.
3. "Egocentricity" cannot support concepts of right and wrong, which consider the interests of others; "Good or bad" (praiseworthy or punishable) are better understood.
4. What is right is determined by physical consequences to the self.
5. "Egocentricity" precludes a (Stg 2) sense of reciprocity or fairness.

Stage 2. 1. Based on instrumental reciprocity; usually involve concrete consequences.
2. Beyond the Stg 1 avoidance of punishment, they are aware of the other person and will take into consideration what the other might do.
3. MJs usually based on concrete, simple reciprocity (e.g., it is wrong to hit another child because he might hit you back).
4. MJ based on satisfaction of needs; attempts to satisfy needs by exchange.
5. More complex reasoning (e.g., it is wrong to hit another child because you want to keep his friendship) should be checked against the criteria for Stg 3.

Stage 3. 1. Emphasis on values which maintain interpersonal relationships, harmony, and concordance within a group such as loyalty, honesty and integrity, etc.
2. Interpersonal consequences replace the one-to-one instrumentality of Stage 2.
3. MJs orient toward the feelings and internal states of concrete individuals.
4. Often simple moral relativism, esp. when it makes reference to personal feelings of interpersonal values.
5. "Law and order": Stg 3 defends the maintenance of society or the group as a

value in itself. Stg 4 or 5 has some "prior to society" perspective.

6. (VS. Stg 4) Unaware that society's abstract system of relations has independent power.

Stage 4.
1. MJs emphasize laws, rights or duties to maintain a social system or order.
2. MJs reflect the conventional position of self-chosen class or group; no "prior to society" perspective based on the rules of an ideal social order.
3. MJs are explicitly and rationally defended.
4. Maintaining the institution or social is valued above the rights or needs of individuals.
5. Not a Stg 5 "prior to society" perspective: addressing MJs in term of the rules and principles upon which a just social order could be founded.

Stage 5.
1. "Prior to society" perspective: principles of right or justice are seen as prior to the upholding of a given social order.
2. Keeps a "critical" distance via principles by which a social order can be criticized.
3. Stage 5 will be capable of taking multiple perspectives on issues of moral concern.
4. Often utilitarian; uses a principle of distribution to resolve competing claims.
5. Upholds the rights of the individual over and against the society/group's rights.
6. Sees relativity of cultural values; will uphold those which don't conflict w/ principles.

Stage 6.
1. Concrete; can give examples of how a universalizing moral perspective is or has been enacted in the person's life.
2. Several universalizable moral principles can serve as the formal legitimation of moral judgments at stage 6. Look for how inclusive the application of the principle actually is.

ASPECT D: BOUNDS OF SOCIAL AWARENESS

Stage 1.
1. Little awareness of relationships outside the family.
2. Can recognize others and name them, but does not have the categories of relationship to classify them.

Stage 2.
1. Identifies with primary family/group: can recognize others outside that circle.
2. Appearances paramount in accepting others as wither "like us" or "not like us."
3. Stereotyping; little empathy for persons beyond primal group.
4. Resolves differences by projection or stereotyping; lacks Stg 3 ability to resolve conflicting pcptns by constructing composite image of those "not like us."

Stage 3.
1. Perspectives & opinions are received from the person's peer group.
2. Note: a narrowly constricted peer group, uncritically appropriated, is Stg 2.
3. Values center on group goals, interpersonal concord, and excludes other groups.
4. Lacks (Stg 4) independent perspective to see faults or critique mores of the peer group.
5. Simple social relativism.
6. Meets interpersonal expectations, therefore Stg 3's opinions will match group's opinions.
7. May project values and feelings of his or her own group uncritically on other groups.

Stage 4.
1. Who is included/excluded is determined by ideological compatibility.
2. Individuals are seen as part of a system or group, rather than as individuals.
3. Able to consider a wide range of viewpoints, but usually does so in order to preserve its own perspective.
4. Tends to dichotomize: it divides persons and groups into categories of ideologically compatible or incompatible.

5. Can encompass pluralism within its explicit system.
6. Social perspective taking & moral judgment are closely related to social awareness.

Stage 5. 1. Willing to include persons/groups different or unusual in their social awareness.
2. Will actively seek contact with "different" persons/groups for the purposes of comparison.
3. Affirms pluralism as enriching; seeks principles upon which pluralism can be workable.
4. Tends to identify with groups or persons on the basis of the principles they represent.
5. Is open to differences, vs. Stg 4's need for closure and boundary maintenance.

Stage 6. 1. Examples of a universalizing social awareness will be concrete. Evidence of systematic exclusion of any classes of persons, makes stage & coding regarding this aspect is questionable.
2. No need to hold his/her perspective in suspension in order to evaluate other's perspective; both are ordered and brought into relationship by one's central loyalty to being.

ASPECT E: LOCUS OF AUTHORITY

Stage 1.
1. Orients to size, power or other concrete symbols of authority.
2. "Egocentricity" causes authority to be "external."
3. Relationship to authority is usually based on the dependency on primary caretakers and the desire to preserve this relationship and avoid punishment.
4. Will often test authority in concrete ways.

Stage 2.
1. Can question authority and ask the reasons for a request or prohibition.
2. Wider range of authorities; includes society's conventional authority figures.
3. External locus; immediate family takes priority over peers or conscience.
4. Conventional badges & symbols of authority are very important.
5. Concrete component: personal relatedness to authority increases their salience.
6. Appearance and orthodoxy are criteria for assessing the claims of authorities.
7. Assesses authority claims via notion of what is proper for a given social realm.

Stage 3.
Authorities will be selected on the basis of:
1. Uncritical trust in socially approved figures and institutions.
2. Personal charisma.
3. Feelings, appearances, or tacit images and concepts.
4. Tradition, not critically examined or rationally legitimated.
5. Group consensus or the appearance of approval by significant others.
6. Self-selected rational principles--would be Stg 4 or 5.
7. Personality; but if individual is separated from the system or institution that he/she represents by critical and rational means, then check Stg 4 or 5.

Stage 4.
1. Authorities can take many forms; all are selected via rational critical

reflection.

2. Assessing the claims of authority is always conceptually mediated at Stage 4, usually in terms of compatibility with the self-selected set of ideological or relational principles.

3. Relationship to authority is explicit and rational; no tacit fusion of earlier stages.

4. Locates authority in ideas, systems and institutions, not persons. Identification with an authority figure, usually indicates he/she represents a system, institution or set of ideas.

5. Able to evaluate authorities from the perspective of a worldview or ideology.

6. Authority is internally located, based on a self-ratified, ideological perspective.

Stage 5.

1. Multiple Psptv --> Tensional or mediated approach to any form of authority. Stg 4 makes one mode of appropriation absolute.

2. Stage 5 will judge authority from the perspective of universalizable principles.

3. Dialectical joining of experience, situation and principles in evaluating authority.

4. Willing to consider cumulative human wisdom and tradition in selecting authorities.

5. Self is above & prior to social order; conscience & social contract legitimate authority.

Stage 6.

1. Locus of authority may appeal to a principle (such as _ahimsa_ or neighbor-love), a personal experience or intuition, scripture or the writings of others. It is important in analyzing a potentially Stage 6 interview to assess how these appeals are being made. For example, is scripture the authority or is it being used to illustrate a principle derived in some other way? Stage 6 takes

authority as residing in a personal judgment based on a direct and disciplined intuition of the universal.

Persons at Stage 6 will often display a commitment to humility in this regard; they will engage in "reality testing" of their intuitions and will not have the self-certitude of those at Stage 4.

2. Internal locus of authority, often challenging conventional authority. One should look for such challenging of convention during the interview, and then weigh this against the life history of the individual, in order to determine what type of experience or thought process is behind this challenge to convention. These challenges are, in the person at Stage 6, usually balanced by a profound respect for the proper use and function of conventional authority.

3. Both Stage 5 and Stage 6 authority appeals to universal or transcendent principles; authority at both stages resides in a personal judgment. But Stage 6 is more inclusive: While Stage 5 feels a tension between loyalty to self and loyalty to one's construction of the relationship to the principle of being, Stage 6 transcends this tension so that the self too is brought within the all-inclusive loyalty of this relationship.

Scoring Criteria, page 14

ASPECT F: FORM OF WORLD COHERENCE

Stage 1.
1. Statements will display an episodic character.
2. World images are partial, fragmented and impressionistic.
3. Will often lack distinction between fantasy and reality.
4. Animism: no distinction between animate/inanimate.
5. Storytelling can be imaginative and prolific, but it is usually episodic and associative in form; no ability to tie events together in spatio-temporal categories.

Stage 2.
1. Temporal/spatial concepts & narrative forms can tie events together.
2. Likes concrete & empirical & logical connections between objects & events.
3. Stage 2 will see physical events in terms of causality.
4. Motive for interest in objects & events is prediction & control.
5. Stage 2 is embedded in the narratives that it constructs.

Stage 3.
1. Synthesis of conventional values/attitudes, not a critically appropriated system of ideas.
2. Legitimates world view via feelings and external authorities, not by rational reflection.
3. Beliefs and concepts exist as tacit value orientations, not as theories about the world.
4. Value orientations often center around interpersonal concerns, uncritically appropriated.
5. Tacit values and belief systems.
6. Deference to others' authority for the acceptance of a worldview.
7. Dissonant views are excluded at Stg 3; hierarchically ordered at Stg 4.
8. Truth determined by "consensus," lacking mediating forms of reason.
9. Simple and uncritical pluralism is often evidence of a Stage 3 form of world

        coherence.
10. Romantic or heroic views of self in the world are often Stage 3.
11. There is usually little evidence of reflection or abstraction in Stage 3 world views.

Stage 4.
1. Explicit system, rationally defended and maintained.
2. Concern with system boundaries and definitions.
3. Emphasis on the differences between systems & worldviews; tendency to dichotomize.
4. A concern with general rules, laws and norms is explicit at Stage 4.
5. Striving for closure & comprehensiveness in worldview; can be reductionistic.
6. Can collapse tensions & paradoxes in one direction in order to maintain the coherence.

Stage 5.
1. Embraces ambiguity and complexity; statements bemoaning complexity or seeming nihilistic may evidence a Stage 4 striving for closure.
2. Uses different perspectives & methods for more complete understanding.
3. Seeks understanding over explaining; displays an openness to experienced complexity.
4. More open to depth phenomena in all of reality, esp. in human beings; aware of mystery.
5. Multidimensional and pluralistic; explicitly holds pluralistic perspectives in tension.

Stage 6.
1. Universalizing; includes a depth dimension. Worldview attempts to express a felt sense of the unity of being beyond diversity of forms. Sometimes simple or perplexing metaphors, they reflect a simplicity that "comes from the other side of complexity." Though expressing a "felt-sense" of world coherence, this is not the tacit system of Stage 3. Stage 6 statements show greater depth and

multiplicity of meaning, whereas
statements at Stage 3 will be one-
dimensional.

2. Statements at Stage 6 can also be
   confused with system or "world view"
   statements that are usually Stage 4
   because many worldview systems contain a
   normative or teleological image of the
   goal of human life that is something
   like that of Stage 6. Stage 6 has
   some experiential basis, above and beyond
   being part of a system or worldview, for
   constructing beliefs, attitudes or
   convictions.

3. Respondent's background should offer
   concrete examples for resolving the
   ambiguities cited above; weigh statements
   against their context or background in
   the person's life history.

ASPECT G: SYMBOLIC FUNCTION

Stage 1. 1.   Lacks distinctions between fantasy and reality.
2.   No distinction between symbol and the thing symbolized.
3.   Symbols of the deity are often anthropomorphic.
4.   Symbolization displays a fluidity and lack of boundaries.

Stage 2. 1.   Can distinguish fantasy from reality, the symbol from the thing symbolized.
2.   Symbols are usually interpreted literally and in a 1-dimensional way at Stg 2.
3.   Stage 2 is able to group symbols and events together to create a narrative.
4.   Stg 2 symbols are not invested with evocative power, as they are at Stg 3.

Stage 3. 1.   Goes beyond Stg 2 literalism & sees multi-leveled nature of symbolization, to a degree.
2.   Won't usually perform critical analysis of symbols and may resist such analysis.
3.   Orients toward the power of symbols to evoke feeling and emotion, rather than to represent ideas or concepts.
4.   Interpretation and appropriation of symbols is often strongly influenced by trusted authorities and by group or communal norms.
5.   Conventional interpretations of religious symbols which orient toward interpersonal qualities but do not appear to be literal translation are often Stage 3 in the absence of other mediating criteria.

Stage 4. 1.   Stage 4 tends to translate symbols into concepts or ideas.
2.   Appropriations & interpretations of symbols are univocal & reductive, often reduced to the truth criteria of the self-selected ideology or world-view.
3.   Statements which reflect the attempt to place symbols within a systematic framework or worldview are usually

indicative of Stage 4 symbolic functioning.

4. Statements which reflect conscious de-mythologizing and the debunking of myth are often Stage 4 in the absence of mitigating criteria.

5. Statements which view symbols and myth in terms of their functional impact on social systems and groups are often Stage 4.

Stage 5.

1. Stage 5 will evidence an increased openness to the evocative power of symbol.

2. Aware of the multivalent nature of symbol. The symbol is not reduced to one meaning.

3. Will often take the history of interpretation of a symbol into account.

4. Explicit concepts or ideas are only one of a set of possible meanings for a symbol.

5. De-mythologizes only in the sense that it is aware of the symbol as symbol and of symbolic processes; however, it is not reductive.

6. Evocative power of symbol and its ideational content are held in tension; one is not reduced to the other.

7. Time and place relativity of symbols and their interpretation is acknowledged at Stage 5.

Stage 6.

1. Use of symbols can take many forms. Often shows a sense of authority: That symbol and reality are not and need not be separate. Exerts conscious and disciplined mediation of symbolic realities. Displays "simplicity on the other side of complexity." Don't confuse "mediated" simplicity with (Stg 1) fusion of symbol and reality or (Stg 2) literalism.

2. Note how symbolic interpretations are constructed: images of the transcendent, images of the goal or purpose of human life, ideas of the process of revelation

and images of human nature will be
particularly revealing.

3. Stage 5 is more open; Stage 6 symbolic
functioning may seem more literal and
univocal due to the greater authority
with which symbolic interpretations are
held. Unlike that of Stages 3 or 4,
however, the "literalism" of Stage 6 is
not the somewhat arbitrary choice of one
interpretation among many, but a
sensitivity to the multiplicity of
meanings that a symbol can generate. The
person at Stage 6 displays a synthetic
style of interpretation that has the
potential to incorporate and explain
interpretations of a symbol that are
different from the one the individual
has chosen.

APPENDIX G

Scoring Analysis Sheet

Used with <u>Manual for Faith Development Research</u>
(1986), pages 42-61. The following directions
apply: Select three to five of the most
indicative passages (i.e. best elaborated, most
explicit, least ambiguous, most comprehensive
passages) for each aspect. A paragraph is
usually better than a sentence for a structure-
indicating passage. List the passage number,
the stage you assign it, and note the criteria
you used to assign that stage. If discrepant
data makes this an ambiguous interview, note
this under "Other." Average the scores for
each aspect, then average the aspects' scores.
The result is the global stage score.

Used by permission from Center for Faith
and Moral Development, Emory University,
Atlanta.

SCORING ANALYSIS SHEET

Interview:_____   Scorer:_____

Passage#	Description	Stage	Scoring Criteria	Avg.

A. LOGIC

_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____
                                Average Logic Score: ____

B. PERSPECTIVE TAKING

_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____
                    Average Perspective Taking Score: ____

C. MORAL JUDGMENT

_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____
                        Average Moral Judgment Score: ____

D. BOUNDS OF SOCIAL AWARENESS

_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____
                            Social Awareness Score: ____

E. LOCUS OF AUTHORITY

_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____
                    Average Locus of Authority Score: ____

F. FORM OF WORLD COHERENCE

_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____
                    Average Form of World Coherence Score: ____

G. SYMBOLIC FUNCTION

_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____
                    Average Symbolic Function Score: ____

Other: DISCREPANT DATA

_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____ ____ _____ ____
_____ _____
                        Average Discrepant Score: ____
                        AVERAGE OF ALL ASPECTS: ____

REFERENCE LIST

Allport, G. (1950). The individual and his religion: A psychological interpretation. New York: Macmillan.

Angel, M. (1987). Orphaned adult: Confronting the death of a parent. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Axelrad, A. (1985). Meditations of a maverick rabbi. Chappaqua, NY: Rossel Books.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger N., & Tarule, J. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind. New York: Harper & Row.

Bellah, R. (1970). Beyond belief: Essays on religion in a post-traditional world. New York: Harper & Row.

Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. (1985). Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Berkovits, E. (1973). Faith after the holocaust. New York: Ktav.

Biale, D. (1988). Classical teachings and historical experience. In Spotlight on the family (pp. 15-43). New York: American Jewish Committee.

Biale, R. (1984). Women and Jewish law. New York: Schocken Books.

Blazer, D. (Ed.). (1989). Faith development in early childhood. Kansas City: Sheed & Ward.

Blidstein, G. (1975). Honor thy father and mother: Filial responsibility in Jewish law and ethics. New York: Ktav.

Borowitz, E. (1990). On the passing of an ethnic era. Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Responsibility, 20(397), 122-124.

Boszormeny-Nagy, I., & Krasner, B. (1986). Between give and take: A clinical guide to contextual therapy. New York: Brunner Mazel.

Broughton, J. (1986). The political psychology of faith development theory. In C. Dykstra & S. Parks (Eds.), Faith development and Fowler (pp. 90-114). Birmingham: Religious Education Press.

Browning, D. (1973). Generative man: Psychoanalytic perspectives. New York: Dell.

Buber, M. (1958). I and thou (2nd ed.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Bubis, G. (Ed.). (1977). Serving the Jewish family. New York: Ktav.

Bubis, G. (1987). Saving the Jewish family: Myths and realities in the diaspora. Lanham, MD: Center for Jewish Community Studies.

Bulka, R. (Ed.). (1981). Holocaust aftermath: Continuing impact on the generations (Special issue). Journal of Psychology and Judaism, 6(1).

Bulka, R. (1986). The struggle of "self" within Judaism. Journal of Psychology and Judaism, 10(2), 5-18.

Carlsen, M.B. (1988). Meaning-making: Therapeutic processes in adult development. New York: W.W. Norton.

Chodorow, N. (1978). The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Conn, W. (1981a). Affectivity in Kohlberg and Fowler. Religious Education, 16(3), 33-48.

Conn, W. (1981b). Christian conversion: A developmental interpretation of autonomy and surrender. New York: Paulist Press.

Cowan, P., & Cowan, R. (1987). Mixed blessings: Marriage between Jews and Christians. New York: Doubleday.

Cozby, P. (1977). Methods in behavioral research. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing.

DeNicola, Karen. (1990, December 18). Telephone interview.

Diament, C. (Ed.). (1989). Jewish marital status. New Jersey: Aronson.

Dykstra, C., & Parks, S. (Eds.). (1986). Faith development and Fowler. Birmingham: Religious Education Press.

Erikson, E. (1964). Insight and responsibility. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. (1968). Identity, youth and crisis. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. (1978). Adulthood. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. (1980). Identity and the life cycle. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. (1982). The life cycle completed: A review. New York: Norton.

Falcon, T. (1986). Jewish paths towards awakening. In M. Spiegelman, & A. Jacobson (Eds.), A modern Jew in search of a soul (pp. 89-106). Phoenix: Falcon.

Fein, L. (1989). Where are we? The inner life of America's Jews. New York: Harper & Row.

Fernhout, J. H. (1986). Where is faith?: Searching for the core. In C. Dykstra & S. Parks (Eds.), Faith development and Fowler (pp. 65-89). Birmingham: Religious Education Press.

Ford, I. (1968). Life spirals: The faith journey. Burlington, ONT: Welch Publishing.

Fowler, J. (1976). Stages in faith: The structural developmental approach. In T. Hennessey (Ed.), Values and moral development (pp. 173-210). New York: Paulist Press.

Fowler, J. (1981). Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Fowler, J. (1984). Becoming adult, becoming Christian: Adult development and Christian faith. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Fowler, J. (1986a). Dialogue toward a future in faith development studies. In C. Dykstra & S. Parks (Eds.), Faith development and Fowler (pp. 275-301). Birmingham: Religious Education Press.

Fowler, J. (1987a). Faith development and pastoral care. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Fowler, J. (1987b). Stages of faith and the appropriation of tradition. Paper presented at the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

Fowler, J. (1990, November). A Newsletter of the Christian Educators Fellowship. (Available from The Professional Connection, P.O. Box 871, Nashville, TN 37202.)

Fowler, J., & Keen, S. (1978). Life maps: Conversations on the journey of faith. Waco, TX: Word Books.

Fowler, J., & Lovin, R. (1980a). Trajectories in faith: Five life stories. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Fowler, J., Moseley, R. & Jarvis, D. (1986b). Manual for faith development research. Unpublished manuscript, Emory University, Center for Faith Development, Atlanta.

Fowler, J., & Vergote, A. (1980b). Toward moral and religious maturity. Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett.

Friedman, E. (1985). Generation to generation. New York: Guilford.

Friedman, J. (1987). Is there a difference in ethical reasoning between students in Jewish schools and public schools? Jewish Education, 55(3), 12-23.

Friedman, M. (1983). The confirmation of otherness in family, community and society. New York: Pilgrim Press.

Friedman, M. (1985). The healing dialogue in psychotherapy. New York: Aronson.

Furishima, R. (1985). Faith development in a cross-cultural perspective. Religious Education, 80(3), 414-420.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gillman, N. (1989). Inside or outside?: Emancipation and the dilemmas of Conservative Judaism. *Judaism: A Quarterly Journal,* 38(4), 408-426.

Gillman, N. (1990a). *Sacred fragments: Recovering theology for the modern Jew.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Gillman, N. (1990b, March 30). Telephone interview.

Goldberg, J. (1989). *Pastoral bereavement counseling: A structural program to help mourners.* New York: Human Sciences Press.

Goldberg, M. (1981). *Theology and narrative.* Nashville: Abingdon.

Goldman, N. (1989). Midrash and interpretation: Toward a model of rabbinic counseling. *Journal of Psychology and Judaism,* 13(1), 37-56.

Goodman, R. L. (1986). *In search of meaning: Faith development theory and Judaism.* Unpublished manuscript.

Grollman, E. (Ed.). (1966). *Rabbinic counseling.* New York: Bloch Publishing.

Handelman, S. (1984). The post-modern Jew turns inward. *Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Responsibility,* 14(277), 29-30.

Harris, M. (1986). Completion and faith development. In C. Dykstra & S. Parks (Eds.), *Faith development and Fowler* (pp. 115-136). Birmingham: Religious Education Press.

Haunz, R. (1978). Development of some models of God and suggested relationships to James Fowler's stages of faith development. *Religious Education,* 73(6), 640-655.

Hawley, G. (1980). *Measures of psychosocial development: Professional manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Helminiak, D. (1987). Spiritual development: An interdisciplinary study. Chicago: Loyola University Press.

Hoffman, E. (1981). The way of splendor: Jewish mysticism and modern psychology. Boulder: Shambhala.

Hoffman, L. (1989). Beyond the text: A holistic approach to liturgy. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Horowitz, H. (1984). The clergy as healing resource. Unpublished manuscript.

Horwitz, R. (1988). Buber's way to "I and thou." Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. (1971). Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego: Edits.

Ivey, A. (1986). Developmental therapy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jaffe, H., Rudin, J., & Rudin, M. (1986). Why me? Why anyone? New York: St. Martin's Press.

James, W. (1983). The will to believe. In Joseph Blau (Ed.), Pragmatism and other essays (pp. 193-213). New York: Washington Square Press.

Kaplan, A. (1985). Jewish meditation. New York: Schocken.

Kaplan, K., Schwartz, M. W., & Markus-Kaplan, M. (1984). The family: Biblical and psychological foundations. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Karff, S. (1986). The "I" and the "we": Personal religion in a corporate covenant. Journal of Reform Judaism, 33(132), 47-54.

Katz, R. (1975). Martin Buber and psychotherapy. Hebrew Union College Annual, 46, 413-431.

Katz, R. (1985). Pastoral care and the Jewish tradition. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Kegan, R. (1982). The evolving self. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kegan, R., Lahey, L., & Souvane, E. (1990). Life after formal operations. Implications for a psychology of the self. In C. Alexander & E. Langer (Eds.), Higher stages of human development (pp. 229-257). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kinsler, F. (1981). Second generation effects of the holocaust: The effectiveness of group therapy in the resolution of the transmission of parental trauma. Journal of Psychology and Judaism, 6(1), 53-67.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). Essays on moral development Vol. I: The philosophy of moral development. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). Essays on moral development Vol. II: The psychology of moral development. Vol. 2. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kraemer, D. (Ed.). (1989). The Jewish family: Metaphor and memory. New York: Oxford University Press.

Krasner, B. (1978). Trust-building and the rabbinic community. Paper presented at the Rabbinic Assembly, West Caldwell, NJ.

Krasner, B. (1980). Restoring relational trust: A rabbinic mandate. A contextual paradigm. Paper presented at the Rabbinic Assembly, West Caldwell, NJ.

Krasner, B. (1981). Religious loyalties in clinical work. Paper presented at the meeting of the Jewish Education Association, West Caldwell, NJ.

Krasner, B. (1986a). Questing for trustworthy experience. Journal of Christian Healing, 8(2), 11-17.

Krasner, B. (1986b). Trustworthiness: The primal family resource. In M. Karper (Ed.), Family resources: The hidden partner in family therapy (pp. 116-147). New York: Guilford.

Krauss, P. (1988). Why me? Coping with grief, loss and change. New York: Bantam Books.

Kulper, F. (1985). Can research challenge and foster religious education? Religious Education, 80(2), 215-231.

Kuperstein, E. (1981). Adolescents of parent survivors of concentration camps: A review of the literature. Journal of Psychology and Religion, 6(1), 7-22.

Kushner, H. (1989). Who needs God. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kushner, L. (1981). The river of light. Chappaqua, NY: Rossel Books.

Lee, Sarah. (1990, May 1). Telephone interview.

Leean, C. (1988). Faith development, adult life cycle and habits of the heart. Religious Education, 83(4), 571-585.

Levinson, D. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Ballentine Books.

Linzer, N. (1978). The nature of man in Judaism and social work. New York: Commission on Synagogue Relations.

Linzer, N. (1984). The Jewish family: Authority and tradition in modern perspective. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Loder, J. C., & Fowler, J. (1982). Conversations on Fowler's Stages of faith and Loder's The Transforming Moment. Religious Education, 77(2), 133-148.

Loevinger, J. (1976). Ego development. San Francisco: Jossey, Bass.

Mader, S. (1986). Depression as loneliness in post generative women: A crisis of faith development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

Marty, M., & Pierman, D. (Eds.). (1965). A handbook of Christian theologians. Nashville: Abingdon.

McAdams, D. (1988). Power, intimacy and the life story. New York: Guilford.

McAdams, D. (1989). Intimacy: The need to be close. New York: Doubleday.

McBridge, A. (1976). Reaction to Fowler: Focus about procedure. In T. Hennessy (Ed.), <u>Values and Moral Development</u> (pp. 211-218). New York: Paulist Press.

McDargh, J. (1983). <u>Psychoanalytic object relations theory and study of religion: On faith and the imaging of God</u>. New York: University Press of America.

McLean, S. (1986). Basic sources and new possibilities: H. Richard Niebuhr's influence on faith development theory. In C. Dykstra & S. Parks (Eds.), <u>Faith development and Fowler</u> (pp. 157-179). Birmingham: Religious Education Press.

Meier, L. (1988). <u>Jewish values in psychotherapy: Essays on vital issues in the search for meaning</u>. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Meier, L. (1989). The dynamics of parent-child relationship: A psycho-Judaic perspective. <u>Journal of Psychology and Judaism</u>, <u>13</u>(2), 87-107.

Mendes-Flohr, P. (1985). <u>Ecstatic confessions: The heart of mysticism</u>. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Miller, B. (1986). <u>Family research methods</u>. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Moran, G. (1983). <u>Religious education development. Images of the future</u>. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press.

Morgan, P. (1980). <u>The faith development of women in crisis: A constructivist window to interview</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston.

Moseley, R., & Jarvis, D., & Fowler, J. (1986). <u>Manual for faith development research</u>. Unpublished manuscript, Emory University, Center for Faith Development, Atlanta.

Nelson, C. E. & Aleshire, D. (1986). Research in faith development. In C. Dykstra, & S. Parks (Eds.), <u>Faith development and Fowler</u> (pp. 180-201). Birmingham: Religious Education Press.

Olitzky, K. (1988). Interfaith ministry to the aged: A survey of models. (Special issue). Journal of Aging and Judaism, 2(4).

Omer-Man, J. (1986). The evolution of the blemished priest In M. Spiegelman & A. Jacobson (Eds.), A modern Jew in search of a soul (pp. 185-196). Phoenix: Falcon.

Palmer, P. (1983). To know as we are known: A spirituality of education. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Parks, S. (1986). The critical years: The young adult search for a faith to live by. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Petsonk, J. (1991). Renewal, a one-generation phenomenon? Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Responsibility, 21(406), 41-43.

Pita, D. (1986). Identity, intimacy and parents' agency and communion as predictors of parental generativity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

Porter, J. (1981). Is there a survivor's syndrome? Psychological and socio-political implications. Journal of Psychology and Judaism, 6(1), 33-52.

Pressman, D. (1986, March). Faith development in the adult life cycle: A theological response. Paper presented at the regional conference of Symposium on faith development in the adult life cycle, California.

Progoff, I. (1975). At a journal workshop: The basic text and for using the intensive journal process. New York: Dialogue House Library.

Progoff, I. (1983). Life-study: Experiencing creative lives by the intensive journal method. New York: Dialogue House Library.

Psychological Assessment Resources. (1980). Measures of psychosocial development. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Religious Education Association. (1987). Faith development in the adult life cycle. The report of a research project. Unpublished manuscript.

Rembaum, J. (1991). A venture in synagogue spiritualities. Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Responsibility, 21(406), 43-4.

Ricoeur, P. (1967). The symbolism of evil. Boston: Beacon.

Rizzuto, A. M. (1979). The birth of the living God: A psychoanalytic study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rose, N. (1989). Toward a rabbinic counselor model: Based on a humanistic approach to hasidic stories. Journal of Psychology and Judaism, 13(1), 19-36.

Scalzo, F., & Hughes, R. (1978). Elementary computer assisted statistics (rev. ed.). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Schachter, Z., and Hoffman, E. (1983). Sparks of light: counseling in the Hasidic tradition. Boulder: Shambhala.

Schlesinger, B., & Forman, J. (1988). Jewish families: a selected review. Journal of Psychology and Judaism, 12(2), 90-109.

Schneider, C. (1986). Faith development and pastoral diagnosis. In C. Dykstra & S. Parks (Eds.), Faith development and Fowler (pp. 221-250). Birmingham: Religious Education Press.

Schneider, S. (1985). Jewish and female: A guide and sourcebook for today's Jewish woman. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Schneider, S. W. (1989). Intermarriage: The challenge of living with differences between Christians and Jews. New York: Macmillan.

Schulweis, H. (1979). An address to the rabbinical assembly. Conservative Judaism, 32(3).

Schulweis, H. (1990). The limits of ideology. Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Responsibility, 20(397), 124-25.

Schwartz, E. (1983). Moral development: A practical guide for Jewish teachers. Denver: Alternatives in Religious Education.

Shire, M. (1983). Teaching adolescents about God. Unpublished master's thesis, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, New York.

Shire, M. (1986). The development of spirituality in the individual and community. Paper presented to a Los Angeles synagogue.

Shulik, R. (1979). Faith development, moral development, and old age: An assessment of Fowler's faith development paradigm. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Snarey, J. (1990). Faith development, moral development and nontheistic Judaism: A construct validity study. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewitz (Eds.), Handbook of moral behavior and development. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Snarey, J., Kohlberg, L., & Noam, G. (1983). Ego development in perspective: Structural stage, functional phase, and cultural age-period models. Developmental Review, 3, 303-338.

Spero, M. H. (1980). Judaism and psychology: Halachic perspectives. New York: Ktav.

Spero, M. H. (1986). Handbook of psychotherapy and Jewish ethics. Spring Valley, NY: Phillip Feldhen.

Spiegelman, J. M., & Jacobson, A. (Eds.). (1982). A modern Jew in search of a soul. Phoenix: Falcon Press.

Spiro, J. (1985). A time to mourn: Judaism and the psychology of bereavement. New York: Bloch.

Stern, D. (1985). The interpersonal world of the infant. New York: Basic Books.

Stokes, K. (Ed.). (1983). Faith development in the adult life cycle. Minneapolis: Adult Faith Resources.

Stokes, K. (1989). Faith is a verb: Dynamics of adult faith development. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications.

Thoughts of a new generation: Rabbis of the '90s. (1990). Reform Judaism, 18(4), 8-11.

Vaillant, G. (1977). Adaptation to life. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Vanden Heuvel, A. (1985). Faith development and family interaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Union for Experimenting Colleges and Union Graduate School, Cincinnati, OH.

Waskow, A. (1983). These holy sparks: The rebirth of the Jewish people. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

White, V. M. (1985). Faith stages, affiliation and gender: A study of the faith development of Catholic college undergraduates. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

Willats, B. (1981). The ego-self axis as a paradigm for understanding religious experience and spiritual maturity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley.

Wink, W. (1973). The Bible in human transformation. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Wrightsman, L. (1988). Personality development in adulthood. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Yedwab, P. (1986). Na'aseh V'nishma: Faith development in a liberal Jewish context. Unpublished ordination thesis. Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, New York.

Zerin, E. (1988a). An intellectual dilemma confronting Reform Judaism. Unpublished manuscript.

Zerin, E. (1988b). The challenge of the "self" in contemporary Judaism. Unpublished manuscript.

Zerin, E., & Zerin, M. (1985). The Rabbi as counselor. Journal of Reform Judaism, 32(1), 21-29.